University of Alberta

The Role of the Ruler in the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle

by

Shane Rene Ennest

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

in

Slavic Languages and Literatures

Department of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall 2001

National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Acquisitions et services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-69424-0

Canada

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: Shane Rene Ennest

Title of Thesis: The Role of the Ruler in the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle

Degree: Master of Arts

Year this Degree Granted: Fall 2001

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as herein before provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission

Shane R. Ennest

607B Michener Park
Edmonton, AB.
T6H 5A1

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled The Image of the Ruler in the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle submitted by Shane Rene Ennest in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Slavic Languages and Literatures.

P. A. Rolland per
A. Hornjatkevyč
Dr. Peter Rolland

John-Paul Himka
Dr. John-Paul Himka

A. Hornjatkevyč
Dr. Andrij Hornjatkevyc

24. 09. 01.

Dedication

This work is dedicated to the Holy Trinity,

My wife Tanya,

My daughter Sofia,,

Professor Dr. Peter Rolland,

Dr. John Dingley and

Dr. Richard Pope

All of whom gave me the knowledge, strength and wisdom to complete this work.

Abstract

It is the purpose of this thesis to discuss the role of the ruler in the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. The Galician portion that is being dealt with in the thesis is considered by some scholars to be a biography of the central figure – Danilo Romanovič. The question, how is the role of the ruler formed through the personage of Danilo is looked into through a variety of methodologies. These methodologies support the main thrust of the thesis, which deals with the formation of the poetical structure of the GVC. These methodologies range from biblical thematic clues, to pre-modern poetics, to Byzantine philology and Byzantine poetical structures.

Table of Contents:

Introduction 1

Chapter 1 20

Chapter 2 31

Chapter 3 69

Conclusion 105

Bibliography 110

Introduction

It is the purpose of this paper to look into the question of the image of the ruler in the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. Considered to be the pinnacle of the Galician literary accomplishment. As Omelijan Pritsak writes,

> "Of all the Old Rus'ian chronicles the Hypatian is the most significant not only because of its value as a historical source, but because of its artistic achievements which make its two component parts prominent examples of world literature of the 12th and 13th centuries. These are the Kievan Chronicle, encompassing the years 1118 to 1198, which has reached us in the 1199 redaction of the abbot Mojsej (Moses) from the Vydubyč(i) Monastery, and the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle encompassing the time-span 1201 to 1292 (actually 1205 to 1289), which has also undergone more than one redaction. Whereas the Kievan Chronicle according to D. Čyževs'kyj, represents the apex of the Kievan "monumental" style, the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle stands out as one of the best examples of the "ornamental" style which originated in Galicia in the second half of the 12th century and included the well known "Igor' Tale". Despite their significance in the study of world literature, both parts of the Hypatian text remain almost untouched by scholarly scrutiny." [1]

Pritsak brings out one very important point and, that is not the polemic of the last statement, but the artistic merit of the chronicle as a whole. This is something that needs to be considered when writing on a topic such as this and not to dwell on the historical side as is most often the case.

The Russian academic A.A. Pautkin deals with this topic inadvertantly when giving a historico-literary background in his article "Izobraženie knjazja voina v Galickoj letopisi." He states,

> "Specialists wholeheartedly agree on the extremely high literary accomplishments of the chronicle. Galician historical narration often calls the chronicle a "life portrait" of Danilo Romanovič Galickij, the

---

[1] Pritsak, Omeljan. ed. The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. (trans. George Perfecky) Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 16(2) 1973, p.7.

> unifier of the Galician-Volhynian princedom. Rus'ian chronical narratives of that time made a special type of historical figure. Most importantly contained within the chronicle is the attention paid to Danilo's reign with exacting detail, as he was the object of attention in the narrative. The qualities of Danilo always interested the author of the GVC, whereas in other narratives and in other times authors were only interested in the bare, dry facts. In the GVC one can see the authors' personal interjections as well as physical accounts of Danilo in different situations." [2]

Pautkin concludes with the enthusiasm of such a tempo that it can only but interest and excite you, "Danilo's living, gripping, personality jumps out of the pages and makes you take notice, no, not just of academics, but of everybody including writers." [3]

From the compliment of Pritsak to the historico-literary review of Pautkin, we, like an avalanche, are gaining, growing, and becoming better in our understanding of just what this chronicle is. In his philological study of the GVC, the Ukrainian academic Anton Ivanovyč Hens'ors'kyj points out that where Pritsak says there was more than one redaction, he was right. Hens'ors'kyj covers in detail all four of his postulated redactions and the five putative authors of the GVC. [4] This author states, "The Galican-Volhynian Chronicle (1201-1292) was not an automatic, mechanical process of one author putting together different bits of other chronicles. But, the labour of writing, reworking and continuation of what many other redactors had done before them." [5] He concludes: "From the literary side, the first two redactions are the exploits of the soldier-hero Danilo; and this makes up the center and bulk of the first half of the chronicle. Because of the monumental working and reworking of this piece and the diverse subject matter, added to this, the search to the answers of the eternal questions of life, such as: what is happiness, where is

---

[2] Pautkin, A.A. "Izobraženie knjazja-voina v Galickoj letopisi." Ruskaja reč'. 3 1982. p.98. (trans. S.R.E.)
[3] Ibid., p.102.

God, how is a ruler to rule and what does it take to break a man. Due to this, a place amongst the epic poetry and methodologies of poetics from that era, the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle found its place in the literature of the world." [6]

In doing so there are four major approaches to this chronicle that are used. The first of these is, the image of the ruler according to Michael Psellus in his work Chronographia. [7] This book is a psychological account of the lives of fourteen Byzantine emperors and empresses written in the first, second, and third person narrative. The second and connected approach is that of Ja. N. Ljubarskij. The methodology is his own stylistic and formal understanding of the structure of the narratives of Michael Psellus' Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. In his article "Istoričeskij geroj v Xronografii Mixaila Psella", Ljubarskij breaks down the characteristics of each of Psellus' heroes into nine (9) categories. A third methodology is presented by S.S. Averincev, in his article "Porjadok kosmosa i porjadok istorii v mirovozzrenii rannego srednevekov'ja", Averincev deals with the philosophical repercussions of Byzantine and pre-modern literary poetics, drawing their sources from the classic/ancient world. The last approach involves the Italian academic Riccardo Picchio and his work "The Function of Biblical Thematic Clues in the Literary Code of 'Slavia Orthodoxa'." In this work Picchio uncovers the systematic poetical usage of Scripture in the formation of literary patterns and models in the medieval Slavic literary code. It is of course, necessary to understand Psellus in the light of the Ljubarskij, Averincev and

---

[4] Hens'orskij, A.I. Halyc'ko-volyns'kyj litopys. Kyiv:AN URSR. 1958. p.103. (trans. S.R.E.)
[5] Ibid., p.99.
[6] Ibid., p.101.
[7] Psellus, Michael. Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. (trans. E.R.A. Sewter) Baltimore: Penguin, 1966. This edition of the Chronographia was chosen due to its strength as an excellent critical edition. It provides a deep historical overview of the times, as well as comments and quotes from Psellus' contemporaries, being much more than just a translation of the work. In popular English- speaking circles, the book was titled by the author E.R.A. Sewter, Fourteen Byzantine Rulers.

Picchio methodologies. It is felt that it would be better to deal with the precedents first and then to deal with Psellus at length in this, the introduction.

The methodology of Ja. N. Ljubarskij is one of universal importance to the medieval student. In his analysis of the Chronographia and the publishing of his subsequent article, Ljubarskij refers to the 'historical hero', not the 'traits' of the Byzantine emperors and empresses, not the 'guidelines' of how to run or not to run an empire. In this instance, Ljubarskij is dealing with the same topic as Averincev's theory of the early-modern world view in the conception of the 'historical hero'; only from another vantage point. Ljubarskij, in his dissection of the work, considers each of Psellus' rulers, regardless of the good or bad they had done, as a 'hero'. According to the Polnyj pravoslavnyj bogoslovskij enciklopedičeskij slovar', "Oni [the king's of Israel] nazyvalis' synami Vsevyšnjago, bogami zemnymi, pomazanikami Božiimi, i Evrei smotreli na nix, kak na namestnikov i predstavitelej Božiix, tak kak verxovnyj, ne posredstvennyj ix car' - sam Bog, i oni izbrannyj narod Ego [...]" [8]. While all may not go this far in their concept of the ruler one can get the idea that the ruler is held up as a 'super person' in a cult like status. Again, the universality of Ljubarskij's ideas are ideal for many areas of the medieval world. As mentioned before, Ljubarskij had nine areas of interest which cover a broad spectrum of qualities. While these areas relate to the specific character of Psellus in his desire to paint the proper picture of a 'hero' it is mainly the content rather than the subject heading that relates only to Psellus. The content that is related as specific to Psellus is of course, the fourteen rulers. In order to see the validity of Ljubarskij's idea, one must look at his topics, 1) Family and background; 2) Style of life, lifestyle; 3) Interest in study,

how one relates to scientists and academics; 4) Rhetorical ability; 5) Honour; 6) Personal bravery, endurability; 7) Quality of ruling ability; 8) Life skills; 9) Moral qualities. [9] The genius of Ljubarskij is found in his simplicity, as one uses this methodology in order to look for heroes, not just rulers. While not wanting of course, to delve into the mundane we more clearly see the universal applicability. For some, the standard chronicle listed by years is rather vulgar, but once an individual or group can be fleshed out of the entries it is possible to trace their 'feats' or 'heroism' according to the Ljubarskij model. Even if the GVC as we have it now exists as a traditional chronicle in the ways of years and entries, it makes no real difference to us. [10] Because of the universal application of the methodology it has been considered feasible to use this model with the GVC.

The next methodology that is presented to further the understanding of the image of the ruler is that of S.S. Averincev. Having briefly touched upon his idea in "Porjadok kosmosa i porjadok istorii v mirovozzrenii rannego srednevekov'ja" and the neo-platonic view contained therein and the philosophical repercussions on the poetics of the era, there is much to consider. In the first instance, we must return to the Polnyj pravoslavnyj slovar' and recover some of the terminology that we went over in considering Ljubarskij. The dictionary states,

---

[8] Polnyj pravoslavnyj encklopedičeskij slovar'. V 2-x tomax. Spb.: P.P.Sojkin. 1913. p.2317. See under the entry: car'.

[9] Ljubarskij, Ja. N. "Istoričeskij geroj v Xronografii Mixaila Psella." Vizantijskij vremennik. Moscow, 33 (1972) p.98.

[10] In his introduction to the Hypatian Chronicle, Perfecky states, "By comparing the Hypatian text of the GVC with its spurious chronology with the Xlebnikovskij and Pogodinskij texts, which are without chronology, and by going directly to the text of the GVC to the lines "xronografu že nužda est' pisati vse i vsja byvšaja, ovogda že pisati v perednjaja, ovogda že vostupati zadnaja" and "vsja že leta spisem, roščetše vo zadnjaja", Hruševs'kyj was able to demonstrate that the GVC was composed in imitation of Greek chronographs which were organized around events and not years and that the first chronicler planned to supply the years after finishing his work, but never fulfilled his promise and his successors followed suit."

> "Zamecatel'no, čto togda kak u drugix narodov byl obyčaj celomu rjadu carej usvojat' odno izvestnoe imja (naprim. u Egiptjan - Faraon i posle Ptolomej, u Filistimljan - Avimelex, u Sirijan - Venadad i posle - Selevki, u Persov - Darii), Evrejskie cari , pri obščem imeni carja, postojano uderživali i obyknovennoe svoe imja, ne izmenjaja ego. Znacenie carskago dostoinstva. Cari izdrevle imeli samoe vysokoe znacenie; ix osoba byla svjaščenna, i im okazyvali samoe vysokoe počitanie, blagogovenie i pokornost'. Oni nazyvalis' synami Vsevyšnjago, bogami zemnymi, pomazanikami Božiimi, i Evrei smotreli na nix, kak na namestnikov i predstavitelej Božiix, tak kak verxovnyj, ne posredstvennyj ix car' - sam Bog, i oni izbrannyj narod Ego [...]". [11]

Put most succinctly, we see that the emperor (*car'*) is a model, a reflection of the Heavenly Being, the *cari* are earthly gods, being also the vicars and representatives of God on this earth. We see the neo-Platonic view of the 'ideal' and the 'representitive' qualities of things, being both earthly and heavenly. It also figures well into the idea of names represented in Biblical theology as seen in the Book of Genesis and the Book of Revelation (Gen. 32:28 and Rev. 2:17). Other such popular instances are Abram to Abraham, Sarai to Sarah, Simon bar Jonah to Cephas = Peter (Mat. 16:18) and of course, the most widely known example in the western world, Saul to Paul (Acts 13:9). The neo-Platonic ideal is re-enforced in the words of the Hebrew philologist, Dr. Jacques Doukhan,

> "As soon as man was created, his first duty was to give names and thereby participate in the divine Creation. From then on throughout the Bible, the Israelites would give names to designate persons, places and God. The names were not simply repeated as the product of a mechanical memory, *they were supposed to express the inherent reality of what they designated* (italics supplied by author). For instance, the name "Adam" came from the word "adama" which means "earth", because he is of an earthly reality. Likewise Abel which means "vapour" points to the ephemeral destiny of the man who bears his name. Not all the names are explained, but the principle which inspires them is often stated. This is the case for

[11] Polnyj pravoslavnyj enciklopedičeskij slovar'. V 2-x tomax. Sankt-Peterburg: P.P.Sojkin. 1913. p.2316-17.

> Eve, Noah, Cain, Seth, Peleg, Jacob, Abraham, Samuel, Solomon, Nabel, Ichabod, Lo-Ruhana, etc. Likewise places are named according to the same principle Babel, Beer Sheba, Bethel, Achor, Jezreel, Achzib, Jehoshaphat, etc, are names given in relation to what they mean spiritually or historically. *The naming process which is a part of the language, works in close relationship with the thought process, suggesting thereby that thought and languare are related in biblical civilization* [12] (italics supplied by S.R.E.)".

In all of these examples, lie one idea. This comes to us as the reason for Averincev's methodology: word, tradition, and religion. The word is the medium by which all knowledge and understanding come to us. Tradition is the desire to keep alive that which has been given to us. Religion is the vehicle which carries the first two concepts with it wherever it goes. Consider now what the philosopher Martin Buber said, "Contrary to the ore from which it is possible to extract metal, it would be vain to try to separate the content of the Bible from its recipient, every idea is one with the word which expresses it; it is an indissoluble totality." [13] Buber states further, "With regards to the Bible, any attempt to disassociate the content from the form would be artificial and pertain to a pseudoanalysis." [14] Doukhan now goes from one covenant to the other,

> "Here also the Hebrew language enjoyed the high status of a "holy language." The New Testament, Church Fathers, Reformers and modern theologians, have emphiasized the value of this language. In the New Tesatment, the presence of Hebrew is felt everywhere: important key concepts (covenant, creation, kingdom of God) inherited from the Old Testament... Furthermore, the way the Hebrew language is referred to suggests a "holy language." It is indeed noteworthy that most of God's statements in the New Testament are expressed in Hebrew. This is the case for the giving of the names of Jesus, John the Baptist; this is also the case for the naming of the last battle of Armageddon. It is in Hebrew that Jesus pronounces the last words on the cross; and it is also in Hebrew that

---

[12] Doukhan, Jacques. Hebrew for Theologians. Lanham, MD.:University Press. 1993. pp.xiii-xiv.
[13] Ibid., p.xvii.
[14] Ibid., p.xvii.

> God calls Paul and reveals Himself to him. The Hebrew language in the New Testament is not just the historical language of its background, it is also the favorite language of revelation." [15]

Why, one may ask, the long explanation about Hebrew? The answer is to give us the proper orientation when it comes to understanding our texts. The medieval author then had a deeper pool from which to work when one sees that they have the theological right to use all means at hand of conveying their idea even from both Testaments. (In this is also found the semantic liberty to understand and use the Hebrew in a more modern context, as was found in the Polnyj pravoslavnyj, basing the rights and privileges of the Russian Tsars in 1913 on those of the kings of Israel, Judea and Samaria.[16]) In this, we come to the concrete understanding of the neo-Platonic philosophical repercussions on the poetics of the era; that one has a perfect, and traditional model, put more lucidly, Riccardo Picchio states, "We know that the Old and the New Testament were supreme models of writing as well as sacred sources of intellectual inspiration." [17] Picchio states yet further, "Since the idea of 'correct writing' (orthography) was intimately connected with that of a 'correct doctrine' (orthodoxy[18]), its impact on literary activity was relevant far beyond the limits of spelling or purely grammatical correctness. The Scriptures were not merely a source of truth regarding the meaning of words and verbal constructions. They represented a model

---

[15] Ibid., pp.xvii-xviii.

[16] The influence of Hebrew writings and Hebraic studies in Rus' is a main topic of study for the Russian academic N.A. Meščerskij. Unfortunately, there is not enough room in this paper to deal with this subject and do it due justice. su. Meščerskij, N.A. Istočniki i sostav drevnej slavjano-russkoj perevodnoj pis'mennosti IX-XV vekov. LGU, 1978. pp.32-47.

[17] Picchio, Riccardo. "The Function of Biblical Thematic Clues in the Literary Code of 'Slavia Orthodoxa'." Slavica Hiersolymitana: University of Jerusalem. 1, 1977. p.4.

[18] Here, Picchio uses the more modern definition for the term orthodoxy, whereas its original meaning in the Greek refers to correct veneration or correct worship which was established in the 6th and 7th ecumenical councils.

for imitation, that is, they were certain paragons of rhetorical skill as well." [19] It is for this purpose that Averincev is found worthy of use and has been used in the methodological approach to this paper.

The third methodology used in this literary experiment was founded by Riccardo Picchio. More exactly, his work in "Slavia Orthodoxa" and the methodology prescribed by him for all of Slavic literatures, "The Function of Biblical Thematic Clues in the Literary Code of 'Slavia Orthodoxa'." Much like the other authors, his genius lies in the simplicity with which he shapes his arguement. Picchio states,

> Because of these consistent references to models, rhetorical devices acted as sets of signs the semantic function of which depended on a general referent placed outside the individual texts. By using rules of composition that were naturally inherent in 'higher' verbal structures, a large part of Medieval Orthodox Slavic literature implied a double level of reading. This means that verbal signs had to be interpreted according to the double of both their immediate context and their models. Any word or sentence could imply a hint to other perfect words and sentences that had been written by inspired authors. These 'hints' might be scattered formal devices or the main thematic motifs of a narrative. In the latter case the whole structure of a written work would imply reference to 'types', that is, to patterns or perfect examples following the rules of biblical typology. [20]

Finishing with Picchio, we have a full compliment of supporting methodologies that directly tie one into the other. This then gives us the support to turn to the main methodology found in Michael Psellus' Fourteen Byzantine Rulers.

Michael Psellus and his Fourteen Byzantine Rulers, why? Without even looking at the texts themselves at this moment, there is already more than enough information that would point us in the southerly direction to Constantinople. We must now look at why that

---

[19]Ibid., p.3.

city on the Bosporus and the "quiet" [21] thousand year empire, and why one of its most prolific writers is of such importance to a small territory and the least of the princes of Rus' and the author of the GVC. Udal'cova *et al.*, state:

> "The culture of Ancient Rus' grew in the unending contact with these two cultures. All foreign influences received were reworked here in the spirit of the Rus'ian tradition, this reworking of culture and thought then grew to become a living, natural part of the Rus'ian culture. Rus' kept its specific political structure, and church, regardless of the Pope and relative independance in relation to the Constantinople patriarchate. Kept its borders safe in the face of aggression from the West, created its own original culture; realized itself through its own literature, painting, sculpture and architecture." [22]

As a kind of sub-methodology, Udal'cova *et al.* mention three areas that are of pertinent interest of the six mentioned. These are the eternal topics of interest, -politics, religion and literature. As these three topics combine, they create the culture that Udal'cova et al. talk about. It would be most beneficial for us to begin with politics so as to get a much clearer background in history and to look more closely at our subject, picking out the microscopic details necessary to the how, why, and what of the relationship between the Fourteen Byzantine Rulers and the GVC. G.G. Litavrin's article "Rus' i Vizantija v XII veke", deal concisely with this problem. He states,

---

[20]Ibid., p.5.

[21] Please see Sewter's introduction to the Fourteen Byzantine Rulers, pp.9-10 for a more concise definition of "quiet".

[22].Udal'cova, Z.V. *et al.* "Drevnjaja Rus'- zona vstreci civilizacij." Voprosy istorii. Moscow, 6 1980. p.60.
Translation supplied by the author, S.R.E. Kul'tura Drevnej Rusi razvivalas' v postojannyx kontaktax s nimi. Vse impul'sy, polučaemye izvne, pereosmyslivalis' zdes' v duxe mestnyx tradicij i v pererabotannom vide organičeski vkljucalis' v samobytnuju drevnersskuju kul'turu. Drevnjaja Rus' soxranila svoj specificeskij političeskij stroj, cerkov', nezavisimuju ot papstva i otnositel'no samostojatel'nuju po otnošeniju k Kostantinopol'skoj patriarxii, otstojala svoi granicy ot agressii s Zapada, sozdala original'juju kul'turu, voplotivsyjusja v literature, živopici, skul'pture i arxitekture.

"Vizantija ne imela sil vynesti svoi granicy k severu ot Nižnego Dunaja. Političeskij vakuum v ètom rajone mog byt' zapolnen liš' vlijaniem russkix; tol'ko oni mogli mešat' kočevnikam vtorgat'sja na Balkany, ne puskaja ix čerez Dunaj ili nanosja im udar v spinu. K tomu že, poskol'ku upročit' zdes' svoi pozicii stremilas' prežde vsego Galickaja Rus' - potencial'nyj sojuznik imperii, - Vizantija skoree blagoprijatstovovala ètomu, neželi prepjatstvovala. Stolknovenija russkix i vizantijcev na Dunae v 1116 g. možno poètomu rassmatrivat' ne kak sledstvie obostrenija protivorečij meždu imperiej i Rus'ju v nižnem Podunav'e [...]." [23]

Litavrin further gives us the details as to the rise of the political union between Galician Rus' and the Byzantine empire. He states,

"Brak Lžediogena s dočer'ju Monomaxa svidetel'stvuet ob otkaze kievskogo knjazja priznat' zakonnym prava Alekseja I - uzupatora vizantijskogo prestola. Dlja podobnogo otnosenija polugreka Monomaxa k vizantijskomu dvoru nužno bylo imet' ves'ma veskie političeskie osnovanija. Upročenie vlijanija russkix v nižnem Podunav'e možno poetomu svjazyvat' imenno s poxodom na Dunaj v 1116 godu. Èto vlijanie osuščestvlajalos' vposledstvii preimuščestvenno Galickoj Rus'ju. Ono ne pereroslo v organizacionnoe političeskoe gospodstvo, no bylo v XII v. vremenami domirujuščim. Nesomnennuju rol' pri ètom sygral tot rešitel'nyj pereves, kotoryj byl dostignut russkimi v bor'be s polovcami v pervoj četverti XII veka." [24]

The background having been set, we move a little closer to the time frame that interests us. In this we see the machinations of politics, the wheels within the wheel. Litavrin again states,

"V period sovmestnoj bor'by dvux imperij (Vizantijskoj i Germanskoj) V 1147-1158 gg. protiv sicilijskix normanov i Vengerskogo korolevstva, Galickaja, a zatem i Suzdal'skaja Rus' naxodilis' na storone imperskoj koalicii. Odnako tradicionnaja točka zrenija na ix rol' v ètoj koalicii nuždaetsja v utocnenii. Vo-pervyx, oba knjazestva okazalis' na storone imperii ne potomu, čto Vizantija sklonila ix k ètomu sojuzu , a v silu ob"ektivno složivšejsja političeskoj situacii na Rusi i v Vengrii. Kievskij knjaz', svjazannyj

[23] Litavrin, G.G. "Rus' i Vizantija v XII veke." Voprosy istorii. Moscow, 7 1972. p.43.
[24] Ibid., pp.43-4.

> bračnym sojuzom s vengerskim korolem, vraždoval s Galičem i Suzdalem, presleduja sobstvennye političeskie interesy. Kiev i Vengrija okazyvali drug drugu neposredstvennuju voenuju pomošč, i kievskij knjaz' stanovilsja, takim obrazom, vragom Vizantii. Galič že i Suzdal' byli v ètom slučae estestvennymi sojuznikami Manuila I." [25]

As time forges onward, the 'plot thickens' and we see how important these political unions become,

> "S 1155 g. Vengrija uže ne pytalas' napadat' na Galic, i Jaroslav Osmomysl, smenivsij v 1153 g. Vladimirko, ne vvjazyvalsja v konflikty imperii s vengrami, stremjas' soxranit' dobrye otnošenija s obeimi storonami, no ne zapreščaja i Manuilu I verbovat' naemnikov v russkix zemljax. Liš' v 1164-1165 gg. otnošenija Galiča i Vizantii stali naprjažennymi vvidu pojavlenija proekta bračnogo sojuza galicskogo i vengerskogo dvorov i blagosklonnogo priema Jaroslavom vraga Manuila Andronika Komnina, pytavšegosja soveršit' perevorot i bežavšego iz tjur'mi v Galič. Vstrevovožennyj imperator otpravil posol'stvo v Kiev i Galič, sostav kotorogo svidetel'stvoval o važnosti poručennoj missii. Jaroslava Manuil prosil o vozvraščenii k prežnemu dogovoru, a Rostislava kievskogo - o sojuze. Soglasie na to i drugoe bylo dano [...]" [26]

The last political step taken up to the beginning of the GVC is the following and very important episode. Again, Litavrin says,

> "Liš' pri Romane Mstislaviče [Danilo's father] galicskom v samom konce XII v. političeskij sojuz s Vizantiej byl vremenno vosstanovlen. Odnako dlja vozobnovlenija sotrudničestva potrebovalsja novyj dogovor. Konečno, ne odni mol'by russkogo "arxipastyrja", kak pišet Xoniat, vynudili Romana otpravitsja na polovcev. V mae 1200 g. posly galicskogo knjazja pribyli v Konstantinopl'. Dogovor byl snova vygoden obeim storonam: imperija iznemogla v bor'be s Bolgariej, široko ispolzovavsej sojuznyx ej polovcev, a Romana tesnil v sojuze s temi ze polovcami kievskij knjaz'. Vskore posledovalo neskol'ko pobedonosnyx

---

[25] Ibid., p.46.
[26] Ibid., p.47.

> poxodov Romana protiv polovcev, okazyvavšix pomošč' bolgaram, i èti poxody, po slovam sovremennika, spasli imperatora." [27]

The stage has now been set for Danilo to enter. As we have noted, not only was there a strong Byzantine influence in the politics of Rus', but an extra special amount of influence and specifically nutrured relations in the West and North of Rus' and in particular in Halyč, the patrimony and tradition of Danilo Romanovič.

The religous aspect of Rus' is famous in its ideology and conception as far as the Vladimir the Christianizer story is concerned. And with the antecedent decision of and conclusion of the story, Orthodox Christianity was chosen. It of course, would be fruitful simply to review the Byzantine influence that entered into Rus' and to appreciate the background in which the writer of the GVC's author was conditioned. Udal'cova *et al.* state,

> "Vozdejstvie aristokratičeskoj feodal'noj kul'tury Vizantii, razumeetsja, bylo značitel'nee na vysšie sloi obščestva, čem na širokie sloi naselenie. Knjazja i feodaly perenimali vizantijskij pridvornyj ètiket, čerty byta i nravov Konstantinoplja. Dlja nix èto bylo obraščeniem k samym vysokim obrazcam, naibolee izyskannym duxovnym cennostjam, sozdannym srednevekovoj Evropoj." [28]

The next quote by Udal'cova *et al.* is an excellent statement of the synthesis and evolution of the Church in Rus'. They say,

> "Vizantijskoe vlijanie v različnyx sferax kul'tury projavljalos' s neodinakovoj stepen'ju intensivnosti. V nekotoryx oblastjax proisxodil sintez vizantijskogo nasledija c mestnimi kul'turnimi tradicijami, v drugix že èto vozdejstvie bylo bolee poverxnostnym, kak by naložennym tonkim sloem na mestnuju samobytnuju kul'turu. Kak pravilo, stepen' èffektivnosti usvoenie vizantijskogo nasledija zavisela ot urovnja razvitija doxristianskoj kul'tury. Čem

---

[27] Ibid., pp.47-8.
[28] Udal'cova, Z.V. *et al.* "Drevnjaja Rus'- zona vstreci civilizacij." p.48.

> vyše on byl, tem ograničennee bylo vozdejstvie vizantijskoj civilizacii." [29]

If this statement then, carries any weight, and is a method of measurement of history, then their next statement speaks truthfully. "Naibolee sil'nym vizantijskoe vozdejstvie na Drevnjuju Rus', estestvenno, bylo v oblasti cerkovnoj ideologii, kanoničeskogo prava, liturgii, bogusluzebnoj literatury, gimnografii, cerkovnoj muzyki, kul'tovogo izobražitel'nogo iskusstva [...]". [30] G.G. Litavrin sums up the religous aspect from the political arena, making one point clear, "Vizantija v XII v. byla gluboko zainteresovana v edinstve Rusi, čto podtverždaetsja i faktami cerkovnoj istorii." [31] Because of the immense influx of Byzantine influence from the time of Vladimir Monomax to the time of the author of the GVC, we know two things: the writer of the GVC was a practising Christian and he was Orthodox. This ties yet again, the GVC to the Fourteen Byzantine Rulers along the lines of social culture - religion.

Because the two pieces of work are literature, and this is, in the end most important for us as we see how it is that the political and religious areas of culture have affected and effected the "self-sustaining" culture of Rus'. From this union of politics and religious tradition combined with the Orthodox/orthodox religious beliefs comes the influence of and by the Church on the most influential and strongest intellectual medium of the day - literature. Richard Pope in his article "O xaraktere i stepeni vlijanija vizantijskoj literatury na original'nuju literaturu južnyx i vostočnyx slavjan: Diskussija i metodologija" states,

> "Izbrav put' vosprijatija xristianstva ot Vostočnogo Rima, Kievskaja Rus', kak i Bolgarija v bolee rannij period, ne mogla izbežat'

---

[29] Ibid., pp.48-9.
[30] Ibid., p.49.
[31] Litavrin, G.G. "Rus' i Vizantija v XII veke." p.50.

> vlijanija vizantijskoj kul'tury voobšče, a v častnosti v oblastjax cerkvi i monašestva, bogoslovija, prava, politiki, iskusstva, arxitektury i literatury. Čto èto v dejstvitel'nosti bylo položenie, kasajuščeesja i literatury, nikto otricat' ne stanet. Esli by Bolgarija ili Kievskaja Rus' prinjali by druguju religiju ili daže xristianstvo zapadnoj formy, ix literatury - perevodnye i original'nye - nesomnenno okazalis' by sovsem inymi. Kak utverždaet I.P. Eremin: "Vsjakaja literatura v kakoj-to mere svjazana s predšestvujuščej ej literaturnoj tradiciej. Èto imelo mesto takže v Bolgarii i na Rusi"." [32]

The words of R.W.F. Pope and I.P. Eremin are only strengthened by the words of Riccardo Picchio in his article "Models and Patterns in the Literary Tradition of Medieval Orthodox Slavdom".

> "Many a Slavist has been puzzled by the problem of the "originality" of Medieval Slavic literature, and the presence of "influence" has often been taken as a standard of judgement. We know however, that any evaluation of the complex verbal art called literature must simultaneously refer to both *what* is said and *how* it is said. The "novelty" of literary expression certainly does not rely on the use either of "new" ideas. It will rather depend on the quality of the literary message as a whole. Likewise, one should not speak of "influences" affecting the "originality" of a literary body, without distinguishing the mere fact of inheriting preexisting ideas or formal devices from a new context. The latter activity belongs to the domain of *imitatio* as defined and discussed over and over again by traditional rhetoric. To proceed, however, from established rules in order to study the particular system of signs of medieval Slavic literature would not be appropriate to our purpose. Classical and Christian ideals of *imitatio* can be considered as components of the ideoligical patrimony of this literature, but their role in the literary system will depend on their relationship with other types, which act as structural units, more that on their intrinsic nature and origin." [33]

---

[32] Pope, Richard. "O xaraktere i stepeni vlijanija vizantijskoj literatury na original'nuju literaturu južnyx i vostočnyx slavjan: Diskussija i metodologija." American Contributions to the Seventh International Congress of Slavists, Warsaw, August 21-21,1973. Vol. 2. Edited by V. Terras. The Hague-Paris: Mouton, 1973. p.469. N.B. Pope is quoting Eremin in: "O vizantijskom vlijanii v bolgarskoj i drevnerusskoj literaturax IX-XII vv." Literatura drevnej Rusi. (Moscow-Leningrad, 1966) p.16.

[33] Picchio, Riccardo. "Models and Patterns in the Literary Tradition of Medieval Orthodox Slavdom." American Contributions to the Seventh International Congress of Slavists, Warsaw, August 21-21,1973. Vol. 2. Edited by V. Terras. The Hague-Paris: Mouton, 1973. p.440.

The tie that binds Pope, Eremin and Picchio, is the fact pointed out that the pure strength and volume of Byzantine culture gave rise to the 'refined' version of Rus'ian culture that we see in the GVC. There is little doubt that it was the involvement of Byzantine culture that shaped Rus'ian spiritual and academic life. Picchio then continues to sharpen the earlier point, showing us a "connection" that easily could take us from the writings of Psellus to the GVC. He states further,

> "Before dealing with particular *types* which in my opinion play a prominant part in Old East and Old South-Slavic literature, a distinction must be made here between what I call a "literary model" and what I call a "literary pattern". By literary model I mean an object of literary imitation, i.e., a preexisting example, such as a literary work, a conceptual formula, or a stylistic device, which has become "classical" ("Classical" implies here the idea of "first-class" excellence creating a standard for imitation) for other writers. The term literary pattern, on the contrary does not apply to any specific work or retorical example with an established shape: it refers to typological units continuously produced by the literary experience and acffecting the development of literary tradition. "Literary patterns" characterize the dynamic being of literature by acting as "lexical" units, i.e., formulae or moduli (in the etymological sense of conventionally accepted "moulds") in the general language of literature." [34]

In a more concrete reference to the GVC and in the light of Picchio's explanation the Ukrainian academic Ja. D. Isaevyč in his article entitled "Kul'tura Galicko-Volynskoj Rusi" says:

> "Avtor gorditsja sootečestvennikami, kogda oni ne tol'ko ne ustupajut inostrancam, no v čem-to prevosxodit ix. Postojannoe primenenie k Galicko-Volynskoj zemle takix slov i vyraženij, kak "ruskyj obycaj", "Rus'", "Russkaja zemlja", javljaetsja otraženiem osnovnoj idei svoda: podčerknut', čto èta zemlja - nerazryvnaja čast' vsej Rusi, pokazat' Daniila zakonmernym prodolžatelem dela knjazej

---

[34]Ibid., p.441.

Drevnej Rusi perioda ee naibol'šego moguščestva, izobražit' Galič i Xolm "vtorym Kievom"." [35]

With this, Isaevic further states, "Letopis' XIII v., kotoruju prinjat nazyvat' Galicko-Volynskoj došla do nas v sostave Volynskogo letopisnogo svoda konca XIII - načala XIV veka. Odnako pervaja ego čast' (svod Daniila Galickogo) byla sozdana primerno vo vtoroj polovine 40-x - 50-x godov XIII veka. Ètot svod byl sostavlen v Xolme dlja obosnovanija politiki Daniila, sčitavšego svoe knjazestvo zakonnym naslednikom drevnego Kieva. S ètoj cel'ju xolmskij letopisec korennym obrazom peredelal Kievskij letopisnyj svod, kotoryj vključal "Povest' vremennyx let" i Kievskuju letopis', dovedennuju do 40-x godov XIII veka. Pered načalom "Povest' vremennyx let" svodčik, rabotavšij v Xolme, dobavil perečen' kievskix pravitelej ot Dira i Askol'da do Dmitrija, namestnika Daniila Galickogo. Kievskuju letopis' pervyx desjatiletij XIII v. on zamenil sobstvennoj. Pri sostavlenii poslednej byla ispolzovana ta že Kievskaja letopic', a takže dokumenty kanceljarii i arxiva Daniila Galickogo, pridvornye letopisnye zapisi, povestvovanija - otčety bojar o voennyx poxodax i diplomatičeskix akcijax. Rabota nad letopic'ju velas' pod rukovodstvom bližajsix sotrudnikov Daniila: pečatnika Kirilla, xolmskogo episkopa Ivana." [36]

This last statement of Isaevyč seems to give us perspective and a little clearer of a focus. We can now look to what Picchio said in his "Models and Patterns in the Literary Tradition of Medieval Orthodox Slavdom". The literary background that we have seen and dwelled on now sets the place for the most important of the methodologies, Michael Psellus and his work the Fourteen Byzantine Rulers.

One should also note that the size of a bibliography is no indication of a surplus or lack of effort or initiative in the pursuit of a goal. It is in the case of this work that the bibliography is small; this is due to the lack of work done on this topic in the literary field. It is hoped that one will enjoy the work regardless of the size of the bibliography and take it for what it is namely, an exploration, an expedition into unchartered waters.

---

[35] Isaevyč, Ja.D. "Kul'tury Galicko-Volynskoj Rusi." Voprosy istorii. Moscow, 1 1973. p.100.
[36] Ibid., "Kul'tury Galicko-Volhynskoj Rusi." p.99.

It is with this end that we are to look into the GVC, for among the images and ideals and politics of history lies the universal desire to understand the image of the ruler. It is the image of the ruler in Rus' as seen in the life of Danilo Romanovič and its history, or underpinnings that ask the questions, why and most of all what made the author paint Danilo the way he did, that are of interest today as they were back in the 13th century.

Chapter 1

The question, why, should an 11th century Byzantine scholar and chronicler be used as a main source, in this case does not and can not mean to be rhetorical. It is a valid question with a very valid answer that is the purpose of this study in general. It is the main goal of this work to come to a coherent and logical understanding of the poetical structure of the GVC. So, why choose a Byzantine writer about whom few know, save a small group of academic specialists? Is it one of those artistic esoteric things, the desire to be really acmeist or obscure? The question "why" is very valid and yet, the answer "no" is valid in answering to any accusation of obscurantism and istherefore, a valid starting point in the search to find meaning. We have covered very much and very neccessary background material in order to make our footing more secure as we go. What it was that we were witnessing was the progression of ideas (the thesis and antithesis, if you will) to its synthesis. What can be hoped that was clearly put forward was the fact that there was a great amount of interaction between Byzantium and Rus'; this interaction was carried out in all facets of the lives and culture of Rus', affecting mainly the nobility but filtering down to the priestly class, their families, those involved with the Church, and monks. Not wishing to digress greatly, the politics, religion, and literature (and the literature, as Richard Pope and Riccardo Picchio pointed out was affected by religion, intentional or otherwise) as the trinity of circumstance as to how the whole of Rus' could not but be infected with the Byzantine influence in any sphere. This is what brings us to Psellus, the idea here is not to say that in the make-up of the GVC, the author had a copy of the Fourteen Byzanitne Rulers by his side; but that in the sub-concious of the author this work might have come to mind in that the two chronicles are typlogically similar. In what is to follow, the evidence is

simply to suggest such an influence and will be presented for you the reader to come to your own conclusions.

Michael Psellus, in the world known as Constantine Psellus, was born in 1018 A.D., of a noble family (there had been consuls and men of patrician rank among his father's ancestors), but in the year of his birth, his parents were only moderately well off. [37] He owed much to his mother, for she procured for him the best possible tutor. He was taught by John Mauropus, the future Archbishop of Euchatia. [38] He [Psellus] was chosen Professor of Rhetoric 'consul of the philosophers' at the new University of Constantinople in 1045. [39] So he became Secretary of State, Grand Chamberlain, Prime Minister; he led the delegates to offer a crown to Isaac Comnenus; secured the deposition of Romanus Diogenes and made sure that Michael Parapinaces took his place on the throne. [40] Although, he died a lonely, and disillusioned old man in 1078. [41] In the Chronographia he tells us of his studies:

> Homer 'the poet' of course; Hesiod and the Greek lyric poets; the historians, especially Herodotus and Thucydides; Demonthenes, Lysias, Theophastus, Plutarch, and the Stoic authors; Aristotle, and above all, his beloved Plato; the Christian apologists, particularly Gregory of Nazianzus... Nor was this the full extent of his reading: he studied medical treatises (and practiced the art); he had a pretty thorough knowledge of military tactics and machines of war; he was acquainted with astrological theories, but gave them no credence; he wrote some poetry, many philosophical works and works on theological subjects. [42]

---

[37] Psellus, Michael. Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. (trans. E.R.A. Sewter) Baltimore:Penguin, 1966. p.13.
[38] Ibid., p.13.
[39] Ibid., p.13.
[40] Ibid., p.14.
[41] Ibid., p.14.
[42] Ibid., pp.14-5.

He inherited from his mother a firm belief in Holy Writ, although he was not afraid to submit Christian doctrine to logical inquiry.[43] As we see, this man could be truly be called a philosopher (in the Greek meaning of the word, i.e. lover of knowledge/wisdom), his prolific career both academic and in government, could not have, for sure, gone unnoticed. E.R.A. Sewter states that the first part of the book, up to the death of Isaac Comnenus might have been written in 1063 and the last half being "completed" in about 1078.[44] Taking into account the proliferation of written Byzantine material and the author of the GVC (there are of course too many variables trying to account for the authors' place of schooling and his teachers etc.) this, in any case, may close the time gap somewhat. One more objection that may be dealt with is genre. It is obvious that by reading this work, albeit filled with religious imagery, it is not of a Church writing nature. It is also not of the typical chronicle style. One then might raise the objection/question,

> "Slabee ono osuščaetsja v sfere svetskoj kul'tury, xotja vizantijskaja perevodnaja literatura svetskogo xaraktera (xronika Ioanna Malaly, roman "Aleksandrija", "Trojanskie dejanija", Xristianskaja topografija" Kos'my Indikoplova i mnogoe drugoe) polučila širokoe rasprostranenie v Drevnej Rusi."[45]

As a secular piece, the work Fourteen Byzantine Rulers would be very interesting, much like Procopius' Secret History of Justinian and Theodora. But, due to the lack of secular influence in the medieval world it is doubtful that a secular piece would have survived so long with such a great influence. Seeing also, that it is assumed that it was Bishop Ivan who wrote the GVC one could not see a bishop using what would be considered a low-

---

[43] Ibid., p18.
[44] Ibid., p.15.
[45] Udal'cova, Z.V. *et al.* "Drevnjaja Rus'- zona vstreci civilizacij." pp.49-50.

style pattern (Picchio) or such an influence (Pope). How then could this have occured? Let us look back to the life of Psellus for a possible explanation. Sewter states,

> "John (Mauropous) was a private tutor and obviously a man of culture, devoted to his pupils. If one can deduce anything from their subsequent careers he must have been an inspiring teacher. Three, in particular, distinguished themselves, and all remained life-long friends of Psellus: Constantine Ducas became emperor; Constantine Lichudes was a leading minister, President of the Senate, and finally Ecumenical Patriarch; John Xiphilinus of Trezibond became the first *Nomophylax* (guardian of the Law) of the new University of Constantinople and later Patriarch." [46]

Three best friends, one, an emporer; two, Patriarchs of the Greek Orthodox Church in Constantinople. Here, the possibility lies within the realm of reason that his works were preserved by the Church because of his two/three friends. [47] Then, this way there is the possibility for Psellus' works not only to be taught, but to be proliferated throughout the area known as "Slavia Orthodoxa", getting into the hands of the author of the GVC only a few decades after the conclusion of the Chronographia. What is most important in the tie between the Fourteen Byzantine Rulers and the GVC are the typological similarities between these two works. It is these examples we will look at as the evidence by which we are to judge that possibility - the influence on the GVC. In all, there are five main typological similarities that have been gleaned from the texts. The first of these examples involves Sts. Cosmas and Damian (the examples and their order have no chronological or semantical significance and were simply written down at their appearance, by this author). In the GVC the author writes, Danilo planted a beautiful orchard and built a church in

---

[46] Psellus, Michael. Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. p.13.

[47] E.R.A. Sewter states in his critical edition that in all likelyhood the Chronographia was written for Constantine Lichudes. cf. p.191 of the Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. The hypothesis put forward about the proliferation of Psellus' work is of course, speculative without the understanding of the historical tradition

honour of the blessed altruists Sts. Cosma and Damian." [48] The Fourteen Byzantine Rulers states, "He [Michael IV] tried various methods, such as prayers and purifications, in the hope of being cured, but he was confident of recovery for one reason in particular - the building of a church in honour of the *Anargyroi* [the "altruists" Sts. Cosmas and his brother Damian were put to death in the Diocletian persecution of the fourth century]. They had been physicians and made no charge for their medical sevices (hence the name *Anargyroi*), in a suburb of the city on the east side." [49] In this next example, the tie is not only typological, but semantical. The GVC says,

> "As time passes a chronicler has to write down everything that has happened, sometimes running a bit ahead of himself and sometimes turning back a bit, which a wise reader will understand. That is why we did not write down the years here, but will write them in once the chronicle is finished in accordance with the Councils of Antioch and the Olympiads, using Greek numbers and Roman leap years as Jevsevij Pamfilov and other chroniclers did recording events from Adam to Christ. We will write down all the years which we will calculate once the chroncicle is finished." [50]

In the Fourteen Byzantine Rulers Psellus himself states,

> "The years have not been numbered by Olympiads nor divided into seasons (as Thucydides divided his), but I have simply drawn attention to the most important facts and all the things which I have been able to recollect as I was writing this book. My object is rather pursue a middle course between those who recorded the imperial acts of ancient Rome on the one hand, and our modern chroniclers on the other." [51]

---

of chronicles in the that period. Compounding problems, is trying to obtain a copy of Ljubarskij's critical edition of the Chronographia in order to further asses this problem.

[48] Pritsak, Omeljan. ed. The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. (trans. George Perfecky) 16(2) 1973, p.76.

[49] Psellus, Michael. Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. (trans. E.R.A. Sewter) Baltimore:Penguin, 1966. p.105.

[50] Pritsak, Omeljan. ed. The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. p.64.

[51] Psellus, Michael. Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. p.191.

Another example of the typological similarities between the two works is found in Homer. The author ofthe GVC feels at liberty to quote Homer in this one and only Homeric quote, "O evil treachery!" as Homer writes, "Sweet when undisclosed, but evil when exposed. Who ever walks in it will meet an evil end, for it is the direst of all evils." [52] The Homeric quotes of Michael Psellus are far too numerous to quote here and would in some sense be redundant, there are nine quotes in all. [53] The GVC author does not copy or cite any of Psellus' Homeric citations as we have them in Fourteen Byzantine Rulers but that really isn't what is important to our study, the fact that a similarity exists is important in that it substantiates a possibility of Homeric influence in Rus' via Greek writings. The author might have been familiar with Homer as an actual interest rather than a simple copying of the words, as no one can place the source of the quote to any other chronicle [54]

The next example on the typological level is the concept of martyrdom in the writings we have looked at. The greatest martyrdom scene is found in the GVC in the entry 1243,

> "From there he (Mixail) went to Batyj to ask him to confirm ownership of his lands. But Batyj requested that he first worship in the faith of his Tatar ancestors. To this Mixail replied: "Since God has delivered us and our lands into your hands because of our sins, we bow down to you and pay you homage. But we will not worship in the faith of your ancestors; we will not obey this order of yours which is blasphemy in the eyes of God." Thereupon Batyj flew into a rage like a wild beast and ordered Mixail's execution." [55]

As we know from the information given, in the entry for 1245/46, Mixail was stabbed to death with his boyar Fedor. Psellus records the details in the "execution" of Michael V and

---

[52] Pritsak, Omeljan. ed. The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. p.42.
[53] Psellus, Michael. Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. p.394.
[54] Pritsak, Omeljan. ed. The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. pp.135-6.

his uncle the *Nobilissumus* (meaning, one the three highest honours/ranks conferred on a citizen, usually relegated to the imperial family.). "[...] the *Nobilissimus* quietly looked round for the man to whom the miserable job had been entrusted. 'You there,' he said, 'please make the people stand back. Then you will see how bravely I bear my calamity!' When the executioner tried to tie him down, to prevent movement at the time of the blinding, he said, 'Look here. If you see me move, nail me down!' [56] Sewter himself states, "The execution took place at the Sigma on 21 April, 1042." [57] Psellus again remarks of death on a different, semantic level,

> "When the emporer exiled the Orphanotrophus, thereby bringing down, as he thought, the pillar of the family, he hastened to the desruction of the rest. All of his relatives, most of whom had already reached their full stature and were bearded men, who had become fathers and entrusted with offices of great dignity in the State, he compelled to undergo castration, making of their life a semi-death." [58]

Depending of course, on the view with which it is read, Psellus' account of George Maniaces could almost seem as a martyr's role for the soldier-emperor. Having attained great rank from being a simple soldier, Maniaces was Eastern Rome's foremost defender. Psellus looks to him as a saviour of the Roman people from the barbarians that surrounded them, only to be beaten and humiliated by the fickle whims of courtiers and politicians. With his open revolt and death in battle, Byzantium, as Psellus felt, lost very much. [59] The previous examples give us what one could consider, martyrdom on a semantic level rather than literal, in the concrete understanding of the text.

---

[55] Ibid., p.53.
[56] Psellus, Michael. Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. p.150.
[57] Ibid., p.151.
[58] Ibid., p.147.
[59] Ibid., pp.192-7.

The last of these comparisons finishes also a typological and semantic tie. This tie is the authors' personal interjections in their works. In the GVC this is seen in one of the previous quotes about the leap years and Olympiads not being written right away. The writer of the GVC says, "That is why we (emphiasis supplied by S.R.E.) did not write in the years here..." [60] One of the best instances of interjection on a personal level is after Danilo had been to visit Khan Batyj and was still in his camp. The author says, "Oh, the greatest disgrace is to be thus honoured by the Tatars! Danilo Romanovic is now on his knees and is called a slave! Indeed, the greatest disgrace is to be thus honoured by the Tatars! We had previously related their murder (Mixail and Fedor's) and that in their martyrdom they accepted their crowns of salvation. There was much wailing because of his (Danilo's) humiliation [...]" [61] The author in this entry is in no way detached or distant, he goes into scrupulous detail, showing in this way, his own personal biases and beliefs. In the work of Psellus, it would be impossible to quote every one of his personal interjections since they practically comprise the entire work; the best example of this would be found as such:

> "If the reader does not find me boring in this and will allow me to go on, I will add to what I have already said concerning my own activities. The fact to which I am about to refer will undoubtably win for me high approval among men of learning, quite apart from all other considerations. And you, who read my history today, will bear witness to the truth of my words. Philosophy, when I first studied it, was moribund as far as professors were concerned, I and I alone revived it [...]" [62]

---

[60] Pritsak, Omeljan. ed. The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. p.64.
[61] Ibid., pp.58-9.
[62] Psellus, Michael. Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. p.173.

We can clearly see that the style of personal interjection is very strong in Psellus and see to a lesser extent in the GVC. There is one more point that maybe should not go left untouched in the area of personal interjection. In the last quote of the GVC it talked about Danilo Romanovic in a dim light as compared with the rest of the GVC, condemning him for his actions among the Tatars. If one is to read Psellus, one realizes that his eulogizing is also mixed with condemnation when Psellus considers it neccessary. Psellus states, "Naturally, I would have wished that my favourite emperor had been perfect, even if such a compliment was impossible for all the others, but the events of history do not accomodate themselves to our desire. At the start of his reign Constantine ruled neither with vigour nor discretion. Unfortunately Constantine's idea was to exhaust the treasury of its money [...]"[63] Psellus continues,

> "Constantine had no very clear conception of the nature of monarchy. He failed to realize that it entailed responsibility for the well being of his subjects, and that an emperor must always watch over the administration of his realm and ensure its development on sound lines [...] the neglect from which it (the empire) was suffering seemed an insignificant item, until by slow degrees, the malady grew, and reaching a crisis threw the patient into utter confusion, complete disorder." [64]

In the same way as Psellus does not spare his friend and most respected emperor, the author of the GVC does not spare Danilo again, lending to the idea of a possibility of a typological tie between the two works.

The evidence has been gathered and presented before the reader in what is hoped a palatable form. It is obvious that the decision is up to the reader to formulate an opinion whether or not it is "correct" to create such a link. As for the author of this work, the

---

[63] Ibid., pp.189-70.

evidence suggests such a possiblity, yet more, the evidence begs yet deeper work to be done on the GVC and its sources. Our use of Psellus has showed that the possibility exists and the work is purposeful for better understanding Medieval Slavic literature, that the methodologies which we have used, Ljubarskij and the historical hero; Averincev and the poetical reprocussions of neo-Platonic theory; Picchio and the Biblical thematic clues in the literary code of the Slavs; and Michael Psellus and his very individual and psychological style of chronicle, stand up to the scrutiny of rigorous academic examination and in constant interaction, moving back and forth between themselves do not contradict themselves but lend full compliment one to the other culminating in a logical and coherent arguement. This arguement suggests that the decision to use the methodologies presented before the reader was appropriate. The political, cultural and intellectual background gave us ample resources from which to draw. What is most important in this is that it was not just a history lesson, but a living process, one that is the master key to understanding a long locked treasure chest. The history of politics, culture and intellect all opened the poetical structure of the GVC and the image of the ruler in Rus'.

---

[64] Ibid., p.179.

Chapter 2

In the search for any answer, any scientist must of course, have a sound formula and objective varibles. It is this formula that that solves the most difficult of problems making them understandable to the scientist themself and then to their colleagues and, if at all possesed by Providence, the public at large. This will then set a standard by which all will follow and judge This is the dream of all scientists, and the social scientists are not excluded. Therefore, it is our great fortune to have such an objective variable in the form of Ja. N. Ljubarskij's article "Istoričeskij geroj v Xronografii Mixaila Psella". [65] In his article Ljubarskij opens many topics and makes them understandable to the reader of the Chronographia, but what is most important to our literary quest is the methodology by which he breaks down all of the qualities and characteristics of Psellus' emperor-heroes. The importance of this methodology is revealed in its universal application and for us in particular the "hero" of the GVC Danilo Romanovič and to the chronicle on the whole. Even as one passes from the Galician side to the Volhynian side of the GVC to embrace Danilo's brother Vasilko.

Ljubarskij's methodology is all encompassing yet very simple. It opens up further the genre of the chronicle, making it a part of the literature student's field of study and not just that of the historian.

Ljubarskij considers nine subjects:

1) Family and background;

2) Style of life/ lifestyle;

3) Interest in study, how one relates to scientists/ academics;

4) Rhetoric ability;

5) Honour;

6) Personal Bravery/ Endurability;

7) Quality of ruling ability;

8) Life skills;

9) Moral qualities. [66]

Ljubarskij himself says, "Sopostavljaja osnovyx gerojev Xronografii možno dovol'no četko vydelit' te ix kačestva i svojstva, kotorye s bolšej ili menše reguljarnost'ju otmečajutsja pisatelem." [67] As this is done the concept of the image of the ruler becomes more apparent. As interesting as it would be to examine and compare all fourteen rulers it is rather superfluous, for Psellus himself states,

> "Fate, indeed, decreed that the new master of the Empire should be Constantine, the son of Theodosius. He was the last scion of the ancient family of the Monomachi in the male line. A long account of this will be given by me later when I launch out into the history of his reign - a long account because he was emperor for more years than any of Basil's successors, and because there was more to relate. Constantine was more active than his predecessors, although it must be admitted that he was not uniformly more fortunate. Indeed in some ways he was greatly inferior. There is no reason why I should not be candid about this and tell the true story. Immediately after his accession I entered his service, served throughout his reign, was promoted to the Senate, entrusted with the most honourable duties. Thus there was nothing that I did not know, no overt act, no secret

---

[65] Ljubarskij, Ja. N. "Istoričeskij geroj v Xronografii Mixaila Psella." Vizantiiskij vremennik. Moscow, 33 (1972.)

[66] In placing the central characters [heroes] of the Chronographia, one can confidently and concretely mark and divide their qualities and attributes which the writter regularly identifies. trans. S.R.E.

[67] Ljubarskij, Ja. N. "Istoričeskij geroj v Xronografii Mixaila Psella." p.98. Translation by S.R.E.

> diplomacy. Naturally I shall devote more space to him than to other emperors." [68]

For the most part we shall look into the life of Constantine IX Monomachus to find the comparisons between Danilo and the Fourteen Byzantine Rulers, as the bulk of the Fourteen Byzantine Rulers is concerned with Constantine IX, as much as the GVC is with Danilo.

We are able to look at the Galician portion of the GVC as a complete whole having the ability to see how one school of literature can grow from another, picking up its finer points without changing at all its genre. We can look to the influence of Psellus in the GVC and yet not discount the influences on Psellus of the classical form of historical writing. In his article Ljubarskii details some of his findings on Psellus and he further corroborates the evidence leading one to the conclusion that the Fourteen Byzantine Rulers has its basis and function in the classic tradition of historical writing. [69] "Rasuždaja tipologičeski, metod izobraženija čeloveka, prijatyj v Xronografii Mixaila Psella, možno nazvat' deduktivnym; kak pravilo, pisatel' pedvarjaet rasskaz o geroe nekoej xarakteristikoj, raskryvajuščejsja v processe dalnejšego izloženija". [70] In a footnote Ljubarskii continues,

> "Xronografija Psella, nesmotrja na vnešnjuju xronologičeskuju ramku, po suti svoej - summa xarakteristik, kompozicija kotoryx vsecelo opredeljaetsja zadačej izobraženija personaža. Realnye fakty dlja pisatelja čašče vsego - ne bolee kak illjustracija tex ili inyx "čert" geroja, a vremennaja posledovatel'nost' sobytij praktičeskix zamena "xronologiej xaraktera"." [71]

---

[68] Psellus, Michael. Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. pp. 161-2.
[69] cf. pp.23-4 of this work.
[70] Ljubarskij, Ja. N. "Istoričeskij geroj v Xronografii Mixaila Psella." p.97. Indeed, Psellus mentions which classical historians he read. cf. pp.23-4 of this work, "Homer..."
[71] Ibid., p.97.

> Ljubarskii then continues with the main body of his idea, "Ètot metod, naibolee otvečajuščij principam normativnogo xudožestvennogo myšlenija srednevekov'ja i potomu dominirujuščij v vizantijskoj literature (naibolee jarkij primer - enkomij), iznačalo predpolagaet obobščenie i abstraktizaciju, podvedenie individual'nyx svojstv pod rodovye opredelenija." [72]

Further evidence gives us more complete understanding as Ljubarskii uses a contemporary of Psellus', "[...] drugoj sovremennik Psella, ne otličavšijsja, vidimo, glubokoj obrazovannost'ju, Kekavmen zamečaet: "Priroda ljudej izmenčiva i nepostojanna, inogda ona izmenjaetsja ot xorošego k durnomy, a inogda sklonjaetsja ot durnogo k xorošemu." [73] This is the same idea that Ljubarskii implies of Psellus' writing style and how it affects his characters, "Ni odin iz imperatorov ne ostaetsja neizmennym do konca svoix dnej; odni iz nix stanovjatsja lučše, drugie - xuže." [74] One need only open up the GVC to see that its style follows the traditional pattern of the chronicle in accordance with the pre-modern world view of history, and Psellus' chronicle as stated by Ljubarskii is no more than a 'chronicle of personalities' and does not radically differ from the traditional chronicle as may first seem. He still follows a chronological path noting the major occurences in the life of the particular emporer; Psellus, as it were, changes emperor for empire as the subject of his chronicle. [75]

Building on this concept of Constantine IX as the main chrarcter or hero of the chronicle because of the immense personal contact and seeing the same parallel in the GVC (the author in many cases was not a detached spectator) we cannot forget that in some sense the chronicler can't help but eulogize the hero as Psellus himself states,

---

[72] Ibid., p.97.
[73] Ibid., p.96.
[74] Ibid., p.95.

> "For these reasons I was not very eager to tackle the history of our times, especially as I knew that in many things I should be ashamed of myself if I did not seize every opportunity of commending him. I should be ungrateful and altogether unreasonable if I did not make some return, however small, for his generosity to me [...] I was most anxious to avoid imputing any blame to him. I did not want to reveal by my words and actions not to his credit and things it is better to keep dark. I was loathe to put before the public a dishonest story, yet at the same time I was unwilling to defame the hero of my former eulogy." [76]

It is with this in mind that the author of the GVC composes, borrowing material from the other emperors in order to weave a story that will lift up the feats of the hero to Heaven, yet bring his follies down to Hell. To understand this whole concept better we must once again look at the Ljubarskij article. As he said in the first quote that was used that Psellus marks and divides the qualities and characteristics of his heroes more or less concretely. One doesn't have to be a Byzantinist to read the Fourteen Byzantine Rulers in English and see how this is done. It is fairly apparent in the words chosen to describe and quotes from literature and Scripture that back up Psellus' words, as well as the episodes of the emperors' life he chooses to use in describing them. This will set the precedent and be the rule by which all emperors are measured.

Ljubarskij conveniently and more accurately divides the character's classifications as such, dynamic and harsh (Basil II and Isaac Comnenus); second, light-minded and inactive (Constantine VIII and IX); third, emperor-hypocrites (Michael V and Romanus III); fourth, emperor-*aladzon* [brazen or hypocritical] (Romanus Diogenes); fifth, women-

---

[75] This is seen in the Biblical books of the Kings of Israel and in particular the life of King David and the main idea which is then reinforced through the methodology of S.S. Averincev.
[76] Psellus, Michael. Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. p.166.

empresses (Zoe and Theodora); and sixth, second class characters (John Orphanotrophus the brother of Michael IV). [77] Although we have highlighted Ljubarskij's classifications as a sample of methodology it is by no means imperative that we are bound by his choices, in as much as he, among other things completely neglects the reign of Michael IV. It is now that we can come to the thesis of the concreteness of the image of the ruler. Psellus' lets us know of the unconditional love that he has for Monomachus, but there, of course, must be some characteristics that show how the image of the ruler is to be portrayed in its full "realistic" as well, as its idealistic sense.

It must be reiterated that as it relates to the GVC and Danilo Romanovič that the image of the ruler will be a conglomerate of all noble and refined characteristics that can be attributed to a ruler that have been handed down throughout the ages. [78]

Having now said all of this, we will now undertake the task of finding the image of the ruler in the GVC and in particular how it relates to Danilo Romanovič, going back to Ljubarskij's nine characteristics and interposing (comparing and contrasting) them with Psellus' emperors. One of the more important things to understand is what made a ruler a ruler in Psellus' eyes. Once we understand, this Ljubarskij's nine characteristics have more meaning. For Psellus - maintaining the height of power and glory of the Roman Empire constitutes a rulers greatness. For example, concerning the metamorphosis of Michael IV he says,

> "[...] for a short period after he became master of the Empire, he treated the governing of it as a kind of joke. He would put off

[77] Ljubarskij, Ja. N. "Istoričeskij geroj v Xronografii Mixaila Psella." pp.100-12.
[78] Even here one cannot forget the Holy Scriptures as they relate to King David. For as much as he was and is loved by all, all of his major flaws il the moral and civil administrative fields are open for all to behold.

> decisions until some crisis arose or some unexpected turn of events, while he passed the time in amusing his wife and in organizing pleasures and pastimes for her. Once he saw the magnitude of the Empire, however, and recognized the diverse quality of forethought required for its managing and the multitudinous difficulties involved in the cares of state - difficulties with which a man who is truly an emperor must be faced - then his character was suddenly land radically changed. It was as if he had grown to manhood, no longer a boy, and from that moment he governed his Empire in a fashion at once more manly and more noble." [79]

Again Psellus states of the wealth squandered by Monomachus, "It used to grieve me then seeing all our possessions thrown away like that and just as distressed at the thought of it today (at most, 30 years after the death of Basil), for no one ever admired the Romans or loved his country more than I do." [80] In essence, we see the true emperor as one that cares for and builds up the state. As we now turn to the nine characteristics let us not have too preconceived a notion based on the former quotes but look to what creates the ideal ruler as we have come into contact with these brief images. Ljubarskij states, "The Xronografia of Psellus, not looking at the outward appearance of a typical chronicle, but by its own means is a sum of characteristics and compositions which whole-heartedly is set to understanding the formation of character. Realistic facts are no more than an illustration of those, or other characteristics of the hero through which a timely study of the scene and actions would change this to a 'chronology' of character." [81]

The first of the nine characteristics that we are to deal with is (by no means the most important and the order of them as done by Ljubarskij implies no such idea) family and

---

[79] Psellus, Michael. Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. pp.90-1.
[80] Ibid. pp.236-7. For the reference regarding Basil II's wealth cf. p.12 and p.45.
[81] Ljubarskij, Ja. N. "Istoričeskij geroj v Xronografii Mixaila Psella." p.97. Translation by S.R.E.

background. As we have chosen Constantine Monomachus as our central figure we will see how this applies.

> "Among others who were living that time was a native of Dalassa (a most celebrated place) whose name was Constantine. He was an extraordinarily handsome man, and it seemed that Nature herself had prepared him for the supreme position in the Empire. Even before his tenth birthday rumour had it that he was destined for the highest honours. It was inevitable that emperors should fear such a man and all of them refused him access to the palace. Fate, indeed, decreed that the new master of the Empire should be Constantine, the son of Theodosius. He was the last scion of the ancient Monomachi in the male line. [82]

The GVC had this to say about the family line of Danilo Romanovič, "These are the events after the death of Great Prince Roman, unforgettable Autocrat of all of Rus', who conquered all the heathen nations and at the same time wisely kept the Divine commandments. He emulated his grandfather Prince [Constantine, S.R.E.] Monomax who had destroyed the heathen descendants of Ishmael." [83] It is made more apparent when one looks into the family line of Danilo, that it is as pure as possibly can be in Rus' without going as far back to Rjurik himself; as far as rulers are concerned. As was mentioned before, the family line of the Romanoviči is very "pure", as the essence of this is vital to the pre-modern world view that Averincev well propounds; in this, it bolsters the idea of the greatness of Danilo as a ruler of Rus'. [84]

---

[82] Psellus, Michael. Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. pp.160-1.

[83] Pritsak, Omeljan. ed. The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. p.17.

[84] As in the Biblical tradition, the genealogies listed in the Bible throughout the Old Testament and in the New Testament were not just an exercise to fill up space in the book but carried a real spiritual and semantic meaning for those who wrote. Therefore, the purity of the Romanovici [cf. the genealogy of the Houses of Rus' found at the back of Perfecky's GVC] and of course, Danilo puts forward the argument of the importance of this "pure" Rus'ian and the "prophetic" role his family was to play, as this idea is found in the Bible.

The second characteristic is lifestyle. Here, as in the golden days of Rus' one looks to history and, in this case the reign of Basil II. Psellus writes,

> "Actually the sum accumulated in the imperial treasury reached a grand total of 200,000 talents. As for the rest of his gains, it would indeed be hard to find words adequately to describe them. Meanwhile, Basil took part in his processions and gave audience to his governors clad merely in a robe of purple, not the very bright puple, but simply purple of a dark hue, with a handful of gems as a mark of distinction. As he spent the greater part of his reign serving as a soldier on guard at our frontiers and keeping the barbarian mauraders at bay, not only did he draw nothing from his reserves of wealth, but even multiplied his riches many times over." [85]

Another aspect of life style that Psellus mentions that we find very little of in practice, except in the Empress Zoe. Psellus says,

> "Surely, it is enough that a man's soul be clothed in godliness, that his heart be dyed in the spiritual purple, that his deeds be righteous, his thoughts full of grace. In a word, it is sufficient if a man be without guile and because of this simple faith there is builded within a temple of another sort, a temple acceptable to the Lord and beloved by Him. [86]

Having said this, we are able to look into the mind of Psellus as we read what he says about the image of the ruler on a higher, ethereal plane. In this case it brings us to the Empress Zoe. "With regard to Zoe's other peculiarities - I must speak of her at rather great length, while the emperor is still taking his ease with the beloved Augusta - there is not

---

[85] Psellus, Michael. Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. pp.45-6.
[86] Ibid., p. 73.

much that I can commend, but one trait never fails to ecxite my admiration: her piety. Certainly there was no moment when the Name of God was not on her lips." [87]

From the sparse details that can be found in the GVC one catches a glimpse of the same spirit that ruled through Emporer Basil. Since the GVC, as we have it, is not written in the same manner as Fourteen Byzantine Rulers we must piece together the details that we have been given. The GVC as a history guide lets us know that at one time Rus' and in particular Galician Rus' was the overlord in the East and that there was relative political stability under Vladimir Monomax and his grandson Roman. Upon the death of Roman we have great political instability as we read in the entry for 1202, "Princess Anna immediately held council with Miroslav - the tutor of her children - and when night fell, they fled to Poland: The tutor left the city with Danilo in his arms while their father-confessor Jurij, accompanied by the children's nurse, took Vasilko and fled through a hole in the city walls. [88] From that day onward the land of Halyč was ruled by the Hungarians, Poles, and Galician boyars. In the entry under 1213 we have Danilo going to his father-in law (Mistislav Mstislavič) to complain that Lestko (a Polish prince) occupied his patrimony, Halyč. [89] As the chronicle relates when the anti-Hungarian faction addressed the Hungarian king: "Give us Danilo, the rightful heir of Halyč, so that with him we could take it from the Igorevič princes." [90] With this statement in mind, we see that Danilo was constant in his vigil to keep Rus' free and strong, "Danilo went forth with his brother and took Berestja, Ugrovesk Vereščin, Stolp, Komov and all of the Ukraine." [91] "Although Danilo was young, he showed his valour in battle: both Danilo and Gleb Zeremejevič

---

[87] Ibid., p. 187.
[88] Pritsak, Omeljan. ed. The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. p.18.
[89] Ibid., p.24.

fought the whole night." [92] We see here that Danilo is obviously a first class soldier and commander, yet at the same time we also know that he grew up and spent a great amount of time in the great courts of central Europe, "While Prince Danilo was in Hungary, King Andrej, who had no son, the Hungarian boyars, and the whole land wanted to give Andrej's daughter in marriange to Prince Danilo although both were still children." [93] The entry for the year 1210 tells us that, "(Prince) Lestko received Danilo with great honour in Cracow." [94] He even was honoured by the kings of the east, as Khan Batyj welcomes Danilo into his tent and says, "Danilo was already one of them - a Tatar." [95] All in all, one can see that his lifestyle could easily have been modelled on that of a Basil or Issac Comnenus (Psellus remarking on Comnenus says of his character, "In the evening on which he entered the palace, and before he had time to shake off the dust of battle or to change his clothes and order baths for the morrow, he was issuing instructions to the army and the people of the city. There was no pause for rest. He reminded me of a man who has barely escaped a mighty storm at sea, and after swimming for his life, has been lucky enough to reach harbour but has has not yet spat the salt brine out of his mouth or recovered his breath. The rest of the that day, and all that night he spent on matters of state. [96]) his strong soldierly ways were not corrupted by palace life. As a matter of fact the one place that decribes his physical appearance further reinforces this principle.

---

[90] Ibid., p.21.
[91] Ibid., p.25.
[92] Ibid., pp.25-6.
[93] Ibid., p.20.
[94] Ibid., p.23.
[95] Ibid., p.58.
[96] Psellus, Michael. Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. p.303.

> "The [German] king rode forth with them [his envoys] to meet Prilnce Danilo, and Danilo approached him with all his troops in battle formation. The Germans marvelled at their Tatar armour: all of the horses had mail over their heads and their bodies were covered with leather, and the riders also wore armour. And the splendour of his regiments was indeed great due to the lustre of their weapons. The horse he [Danilo] rode was a wonder to behold and his saddle was of pure gold. His arrows and sword were adorned with gold and other ornaments, so that one did not cease marvelling at them while he himself was dressed in a fur coat trimmed with Greek olovir and gold lace and boots made of green leather stitched together with gold." [97]

This was done because it was supposedly, "In accordance with the traditions of Rus' and his forefathers." [98] This seems to suggest that Danilo was as humble and moderate as Basil in all that he did. As we see in his appearance before the Germans, it was in his dress that reinforced this. It was not the gold that amazed the Germans as was its Eastern (Tatar) appearance. One really would expect a provincial prince like Danilo to try and impress these Western rulers by his westernization, but he did not and it could have been his aim to show off the 'true' greatness of the vast Kievan state. So, in fact he chose dress that a true Rus'ian, soldier and prince of the East would wear showing his true status and inner being. In discussing the second aspect of the ruler according to Psellus in which we saw Zoe, that is his relationship with God, we see that Danilo is not so far off. We often find Danilo in church and in prayer [99] and he tries as best as possible to quote scripture, "But Danilo quoted to them from the Scriptures: He who hesitates to do battle is a cowardly soul." Danilo is also found a second time quoting the same inspirational book of Scripture, "It

---

[97] Pritsak, Omeljan. ed. The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. pp.61-2. [97]In Perfecky's notes, he relates that this quote is a borrowing from the Chronicle of Malalas as it was found by Orlov in "K voprosu.", pp.106-7. p138. It must be mentioned, that Perfecky does not give more detail to this quote by Orlov and that creates difficulties in following this interesting lead.
[98] Ibid., p.62.
[99] Ibid., pp.33,45,57-8.

does not behoove a soldier who has set out to do battle to turn back. He should either be victorious or killed by the enemy." [100] Although, Perfecky says that it really isn't Scripture, but one of the popular novels about the history of Alexander the Great called the "Alexandria". [101] So, as much as is possible, we see the spiritual journey of this soldier-king.

Ljubarskij's third quality discusses the ruler's interest in study, scientists, and academics. Simplistically, one could say that there were at the time of Danilo no academics, scientists or study going on in Rus'. This is of course a generalization, but one with merit. If we look at this problem from another angle and try to redefine the terms, study, scientist, and academic to include the ecclesiastical world, them we have something to pursue however tenuous this might be. If we were to look to the life of Psellus himself we see that yes, he was a great chronicler, but also a scientist and monk. It would be rather superfluous to mention all of lthe sciences that Psellus had studied but let his own words open up our third section.

> "But there is a new philosophy, based on the mystery of our Christian religion, which transcends the ancient systems. This mystery, too, has a dual aspect, in nature (human and divine) and in time (finite and infinite), not to mention a further dualism when one considers how it is capable of proof and yet the object of faith and divinely inspired into men's conciousness. It was this philosophy rather than the profane which became the object of my special study." [102]

---

[100] Ibid., p.40 and 43.
[101] Ibid., p.135.
[102] Psellus, Michael. Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. p.176.

In applying the methodology and philosophy of Psellus then there is no doubt that religion and religiosity will fit into our definition and we can then proceed. One can see in Constantine IX this great love of all sciences, however he himself not being anything akin to a scholar, he very much appreciated them. This ideal is concentrated in Monomachus as is seen in the following example when he places Constantine Lichudes in charge of the Empire. [103] For, Lichudes was an accomplished orator, rhetorician, and politician specializing in civil law. Not only does that stop there, but he even accepted Psellus' teachers, "to the imperial circle and enjoyed to the full what men may call 'high-life'." [104] Another example that portrays this virtue notes Constantine IX studying philosophy and poetry with Psellus. [105] And when Psellus wanted to enter the monastery, the emperor tried to disuade him saying that Psellus was, 'the comfort of his soul', 'his heart and light and life', and he didn't want Psellus to 'leave him in darkness'. [106] Once Psellus and his companions had been tonsured and the academic role diminished at the court, Psellus noted that, "He [Constantine IX] took refuge again in wordly pleasures.[107]

These virtues that are to found in Constantine IX are no less pronounced in the character of Danilo Romanovič. To do justice properly to the Rus'ian prince three examples have been selected. All of the examples will be explained once our methodology has been established The first of these tells us that Danilo went to the Vydubyči Monastery of God's champion the Archangel Michael and summoned the elders and the entire monastic order and requested the abbot and all the brothers to pray for him. And they

---

[103] Ibid., p.248.
[104] Ibid., p.255.
[105] Ibid., p.257.
[106] Ibid., p.258.
[107] Ibid., p.169.

prayed that he might receive Divine grace, which he did. [108] In this first example we see nothing short of respect for the workers of God's word. In the second example Danilo went to Zidičin to worship and pray before the miraculous icon of St. Nicholas. Jaroslav summones him to Luck, and Danilo's boyars said to him, "Take Luck and capture their prince." But Danilo answered that he had come here to pray to St. Nicholas and hence could not do this and went to Volodimer'. [109] In this second example we see the great reverence for God's property as it relates in human terms. Finally,

> "The Pope sent the same esteemed envoys bearing a wreath, a scepter, and a crown, which symbolizes royal authority and which they requested Danilo to accept from them as their son. Then the Pope's legate Opizio came to Danilo in Dorohyčyn bearing a crown and promising him aid from the Pope. Danilo did not want to accept the crown, but his mother persuaded him as did Boleslav, Somovit and the Polish boyars, promising to help him against the heathens if he would only accept the crown. Thus he received his crown from God, from the Church of the Holy Apostles, from the throne of St.Peter, from his spiritual father Pope Nekentij IV [Pope Innocent IV] and from all his bishops. For Nekentij cursed all those who abused the true Greek faith and wished to call a Council for the purpose of discussing the true faith and the unification of the Church." [110]

Again, if we can borrow from Psellus the concept of Christianity as a new philosophy (as seen in the first half of this sub-section on Constantine IX), then we understand that those who undertake the study of this philosophy are philosophers. And, the philosophers who study Church canon and the Scriptures and other peripheral material relating to the further understanding of this new philosophy as the academics and scientists, then through our

---

[108] Pritsak, Omeljan. ed. The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. pp.57-8.
[109] Ibid., p.33.
[110] Ibid., p.67-8.

examples we can imply a positive connection. We see in the first and third examples that Danilo expressly and intimately trusts the knowledge and understanding of his academics. He believes in what they say and he believes that what they teach is worth listening to. In comparing Danilo with the Empress Zoe it is not enough to stop here. As we have seen, he is found in the places where these academics work, he does not wait for them to come to him as he diligently searches them out. As is given in the second example, he attends their 'universities' and wishes to refresh himself in this spiritual 'library' where wisdom and life are compiled and found and that he will not even break his contemplation once started, not even to better himself. Some of the examples given are the church in Zidičin, the church of the Blessed Virgin, the Vydubyči monastery, the churches of St. John Chrysostom, Sts. Cosmas and Damian and the church of the Blessed Mother. If we read closely, we also notice that in most of the cities Danilo builds, he tries to proliferate the knowledge that these scientists have, as he built several chuches, too. [111]

In the area of rhetoric, Psellus gives us four examples which are of interest. It is interesting as we look to our characters to see which one would fill the role of Danilo. The first personage, or character is not of hero status although an emperor. It is Constantine VIII. As Psellus says,

> "However when he did have occasion to make a speech, he astonished all hearers by his logical arguments. As a matter of fact, he had not much learning. He accquired a smattering of culture, just as much as one considers enough for children, but he was endowed with great natural intelligence and more that ordinary grace. He had the added advantage of a tongue both melodious and refined:

---

[111] ibid., p.75-6.

> arguments conceived in his mind were so to speak, brilliantly delivered by his tongue." [112]

Speaking about Michael IV he says, "He was ready, moreover, with the witty retort, and his tongue was well equipped to this end, for it lacked monotony, and he spoke fluently; with a voice both fine and resonant." [113] Unlike the previous personage who received no categorization in Ljubarskij's article, although being a favorite emperor of Psellus', Ljubarskij talks about the role of secondary cast characters, here we are to use one for various reasons. The first reason could be that he was a friend of Psellus', the second could be because he was well educated in the sciences that Psellus himself loved and believed were most important, and third, in our case of the GVC, that he was the immediate successor to the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the patriarch that maintained the schism of the Greek Church from Rome. [114] Psellus says,

> "The gentleman in question was of noble birth, a first-class scholar, a practical and witty speaker in all departments of oratory and an experienced politician. In addition to his study of rhetoric (an art on which he conferred greater desticion because of his unusual powers of persuasion) he applied himself to civil law. When delivering a public speech, he cultivated a style both elegant and pure Attic, but in everyday business he spoke simply, in the direct language of the ordinary man. He had a distinguished presence and a fline figure: his voice, too, lent him dignity for it had resonance and clarity - qualities that were much evident when he read the imperial decrees from the balcony in the palace." [115]

---

[112] Psellus, Michael. Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. p.56.
[113] Ibid., p.90.
[114] Ibid., pp.315-6.
[115] Ibid., p.248.

Unfortunately, unlike The Fourteen Byzantine Rulers which gives us great deductive evidence on the rhetoric ability of its heroes, we are left to inductively see the rhetoric power of Danilo. The year 1254 tells us that,

> "The voyevoda Andrej sallied forth against them (Poles and Rus'ians) from Opava with his Czechs. Both sides came to blows and Andrej emerged victorious, for there were few Poles. Some of the Poles he killed, the others he took captive and those that escaped were paralyzed by fear. Danilo rode up to them and addressed them thus: "Why are you frightened? Do you not know there can be no war without killing and that you engaged soldiers not women? What is so unusual if a man has been killed in battle? Others die at home without glory, but these men have died wilth honour. Strengthen your hearts with courage and take up your weapons against the enemy!" With these words he bolstered their spirits and after speaking of many other things to them, he advanced toward Opava." [116]

This next example is a witness to the power of Danilo's divinely inspired words. The chronicler records Danilo's heroic feat as is written, some vassal of a Rus'ian prince called Songur told Danilo he should bow down and worship a bush. "There a vassal of Jaroslav Vsevolodovič called Songur approached him and suggested that since Danilo's "brother" Jaroslav worshipped a bush, he should also." [117] "But Danilo replied that the Devil was speaking through his lips and that God would shut them so that no one would hear what he said. And at that moment he was summoned by Batyj and was thus deilivered by God from their godless devilry and sorcery." [118] This last quote is much like the first in that it reinforces his rhetoric ability and command. "But Danilo said, "It does not behoove soldier who has set out to do battle to turn back. He should either be victorious or killed by the

---

[116] Pritsak, Omeljan. ed. The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. p.65.
[117] Ibid., p.58.
[118] Ibid., p.58.

enemy. I tried to restrain you, but now I see that you have timid hearts. Did I not tell you that tired soldiers should not march against fresh troops? Why are you afraid now? Go and attack them!" There they meet the Polovcian host near Torčesk and a fierce battle ensued." [119] It is with these two battle quotes that we must use our creative imagination and logic. Let us now picture Danilo, strong, valiant, brave, talking to these exhausted troops, themselves grown men, afraid like children. It would take a lot for this out-numbered and tired (in both cases) group to be thrown into a frenzy, even to attack the enemy not to defend or sue for terms of peace. A man who doesn't know what to say or how to say it would not do. He says the right things to the right people and can persuade even the most unnerved men to risk his life. As well as quality of voice, monotone, high-pitched, faltering, squeaky, or any other flaw would not do. A deep, melodious, steady voice is what is needed to rouse the troops yet bark out the orders over the battle field. [120] Now, whether one wants to attribute this to Issac Comnenus, Constantine VIII, Michael IV, or Constantine Lichudes, one cannot be certain, but one can be certain that his rhetorical ability shows in the same light as these four great emperors.

The fifth characteristic from the Ljubarskij methodology is honour but honour is something that cannot stand alone in the medieval mind. For the sake of rounding out this quality we will couple it with the ninth point of Ljubarskij's list - moral qualities. For now we must separate ourselves from the concept of 'Realpolitik' and the schools of 'realism' and 'naturalism' which are the basis for our modern journalistic-like concept of literature. We will go back in time to another school and another methodology. Then we see the

---

[119] Ibid., p.43.
[120] Pautkin, A.A. "Izobraženie knjazja-voina v Galickoj letopisi." p.99.

concepts of Sergej Averincev from his article "Porjadok kosmosa i porjadok istorii v mirovozzrenii rannego srenevekov'ja". Averincev states,

> "Already in Platonism there was an interest in the order of the universe. This was connected with the feeling of threat under the other order - materialism. In early Byzantine ideology this interest is painted by new tones in connection with the destruction of that which was left from the order of materialism. 'Easily mistaken' earthly laws became even more desired. People must learn to listen to the stars - such was an early Byzantine transcription of the Gospel prayer - let Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven -. The correlation of cosmic motifs with social problems are intensified in the words of Gregory Nazianzen - let not the submission which holds earth and heaven together be destroyed, for through the absence of defined leaders we won't fall into anarchy. Every word about the reality of world order turns into a proverb or allegory about the desireability of individual and societal order. This is understood as a hierarchy (the law of submission being the most authoritative principle). The immutable and rigid symmetry of images of Byzantine imperial art, binding the esthetics of courtly ceremony and military pomp imply such a universality. Plato could only dream of such a high level of formalism of the artistic canon and government custom being concretely entrenched each in the other, but only now could this become a reality. The world of cosmic speculation and social ethics received such a joining link which could not have existed in the time of Plato." [121]

Averincev here is talking about the Bzyantine-medieval, or simply Biblical concept of a divine plan in heaven and that things on earth are to be seen in terms of type and anti-type. Having this in mind, there can be no 'Realpolitik' as one must always emulate those who have gone before. We will say here then, that Danilo can then combine the two principles of honour and moral qualities for if his honour will be positive then his moral qualities will reflect this or vise versa.

---

[121] Averincev, S.S. "Porjadok kosmosa i porjadok istorii v mirovozzrenii rannego srednevekov'ja." Vizantia i anticnost'. Moscow: Nauka, 1978. pp.268-9.

We now will see how Psellus' favorite emperor reveals these characteristics.

"In all my past experience, I have never seen a man more sensitive to the feelings of others. In my opinion, none of the present generation can compare with him in that respect. What is more, I know of nobody more generous, nor one who in his behvior resembled the ideal emperor. He was persuaded that his power had been inherited for this very purpose, that he might exhibit these qualities. Any day therefore, that passed without some kindly deed on his part, any day in which he did not exercise in some way his generous instincts, marked a failure to fulfil his duties as a sovereign. "Nor did he sow the seeds of well-doing in what I may call fertile hearts, in order to reap the harvest of gratitude at once, and certainly the recipients were not more eager to show forth the fruits of thankfulness than he to sow 'the earth, rich-clodded and fat".

For the sake of those who appreciate such anecdotes, I will give a brief example of this characteristic virtue. A certain man was caught stealing military funds, and was condemned to pay a heavy fine, far beyond his means. He pleaded that restitution to the public funds should be made from his own personal property alone: he did not want to leave the obligation to meet debts incurred by himself as a heritage to his children. At this point he began to strip off his clothes, as if he could meet his liabilities in only one way - by divesting himself of all possessions.

Here Constantine interrupted him, his eyes full of tears. 'Wait, my dear fellow! Surely you would be ashamed to bring dishonour on your family? You mustn't reduce yourself to such sudden and extreme poverty that even food and clothing rely on others' generosity!' - 'But, Sir', replied the man, 'with all the good in the world, I could not possibly provide the money they ask for.' And the emperor's answer to this? 'If someone were to pay off a part of this debt, would you be satisfied that justice had been done?' - 'It would be a godsend,' said the other, 'but, so far as I can see, no angel or divine being had come down from heaven to watch over human justice and busy itself with the affairs of this world's cities.' - 'Never mind,' answered Constantine, 'I will act the part and relieve you a third of the debt.'

At these words the nobleman could restrain himself no longer, but fell on his knees on the ground and almost expired with joy. Constantine, deeply impressed by his gratitude, went on: 'I will do more. I will pay off two-thirds.' And then, before the other

could really inderstand what he had said, he added: 'And the rest!'"
[122]

About the greatness of Constantine IX that is not all Psellus has to say,

> "When he acted as judge, it was impossible for an onlooker to distinguish either the successful litigant, or the defeated party by their behavior after he had given verdict. To put it more clearly, the part that obtained the white pebble (won the case) naturally went away radiant with joy; his opponent, on the other hand, even he knew that he had lost the case, had no hopes of success, but meeting with treatment more lenient than expected, he too went away in triumph, more privileged than he had dared to anticipate. [123]

One last example reinforces the characteristics by which we judge a great emperor, "But if he discovered men going so far as to utter blasphemies against the Lord Himself, he punished them by exile, or restricted their movements to a circumscribed area, or kept them in close confinement prison, and he used to bind himself by secret oaths never to release them." [124] In these examples we see the positive convergence of honour and moral qualities that make the medival author proud. In these examples one thinks of the Biblical characters of Moses, Joseph, David (Monomachus wasn't perfect) or Daniel. As it stands, the possibility lies in the realm of reality that the shaping of Monomachus' image formed the ideal, or prototype of Danilo Romanovič.

Danilo, as we have read earlier, always strove to regain or retain Halyč as it had been his father's city and, therefore, his patrimony. As we have also seen, it was often ruled by foreign princes or their retainers. It is no surprise that the author of the GVC ususally refers to the inhabitants of Halyč as faithless and godless and especially in

---

[122] Psellus, Michael. Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. pp.244-5.
[123] Ibid., p.242.

reference to their boyars. [125] On this occasion Danilo besieged Halyč with a large army, approached the city gates and said,

> "O, citizens! How long will you endure being ruled by foreign princes? But they cried out: "This is our God-given ruler" and ran to him like children to their father, like bees to their queen, like those dying of thirst to a spring. But Bishop Artemij and Prince Rostislavič's *dvorskij* (chamberlain) Gregorij Vasiljevič would not let him enter the city. However, when they saw they could not restrain the whole city, they came out like cowards who feared the consequences of the city's surrender, with tears in their eyes and downcast faces, and licking their dry lips, since they no longer had the power to rule. And forced by circumstances, they welcomed Prince Danilo and asked him to take the city. The Galician boyars, however fell at his feet begging for mercy wilth the words: "We haved sinned before you by letting another prince rule over us." And Danilo assured them of mercy if they promised not to do this again so that a worse fate would not befall them." [126]

One can easily see here how Danilo thought it only right to do good to all those who for so long mistreated him. He was honouring his father and his people by not putting the city to the sword. Another episode illustrates Danilo's moral qualities in the respectful and honorable treatment of those who betrayed him in the entry dated 1230. After Danilo had yet again regained the throne of Halyč, he sent his royal groom Ivan to fetch the faithless Molibogovič boyars from their estates along the Voldrissa. Ivan Mixailovič captured 28 of them, but they were spared and not put to death. Once, while Danilo was making merry at feast, one of these godless boyars threw the contents of his goblet in Danilo's face. But Danilo bore the insult, hoping that God would repay them some day. [127] Having spoken

---

[124] Ibid., p.244.
[125] Pritsak, Omeljan. ed. The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. pp.38,31,22,57.
[126] Ibid., p.45.
[127] Ibid., p.38.

earlier about Danilo's love of the traditions of Rus' and his love of Rus' we see yet another side of Danilo.

> "The ever proud Filja advanced upon Halyč, hoping to encircle the land and to empty the sea with his great host of Hungarians. He was wont to say that one stone could break many pots or to boast that one needed only a sharp sword and a swift horse to kill many Rus'ians. But God would not tolerate this and later the ever proud Filja was killed by Danilo Romanovič. [128]

We can see and feel the righteous indignation of Danilo against this Hungarian interloper. This last example is an excellent example of the gracious character of a righteous God-fearing ruler, whether it be Constantine IX Monomachus or even greater, as a King David in Jerusalem. "As Danilo was occupying the city, he remembered King Andrej's (the Hungarian king's) affection for him and released his son, accompanying him to the Dniester." [129] It is not difficult to take note that the honour and moral qualities that are ascribed to Psellus' favorite emperor are also ascribed to the GVC author's favorite prince. In both cases they show the benevolence and beauty of a true and natural born ruler.

In our next category which Ljubarskij prescribes, we will look at personal bravery/ endurability. From Psellus' choice of fourteen rulers almost all of them would be excellent examples of personal bravery and endurability especially, Basil II, or Issac Comemnus. We will stay away from the soldier-emperor type of ruler as mentioned above and stay with the courtier-emporer Constantine IX. Here Psellus writes about Monomachus,

---

[128] Ibid., p.26.
[129] Ibid., p.37.

> "He had another good quality, one that I myself do not wholly approve of, but he held it in high esteem. However, I will leave my readers to judge for themselves. He completely neglected to take precautions for his own safety. When he was sleeping the doors were left open and no guard kept watch outside his bedchamber. Indeed, the chamberlains often left him altogether and it was possible for anyone to walk past his door and pass it again on the way back, without the slightest interference from others. If one took the liberty of rebuking him for this laxity, Constantine was not vexed about it, but he dismissed the reproach as unnecessary. It was due, he said, to wrong ideas about God. What he meant by this was that he occupied the throne by the grace of God and by Him alone he was protected. Being defended by the Perfect Guard, he had no need of human sentinels who fell short of perfection. [130]

It is needless to say that the rhetorician Psellus tried to persuade Monomachus but to no avail and even two attempted assinations didn't change his mind. Psellus mentions more,

> "Some special fortune, it was said, favored the emperor and because of it he would stamp out every revolt with the greatest of ease. It is a fact, too, that Constantine himself used to refer proudly to certain prophecies and auguries connected with his reign. He recalled extraordinary visions and dreams some that he had experienced himself, others he had heard from soothsayers. On this subject he had some wonderful things to say. So it came about when danger was imminent and while other men were alarmed and filled with dread for the future, he himself was confident of ultimate victory. He would comfort the faint-hearted and face disaster with a self-composure that gave no indication of the perils threatening him." [131]

This is very evident in his demeanor during the Tornician revolt. While most of Constantinople was under the control of the rebel leader Leo Tornicius and the rebels were already laying seige to the imperial palace Psellus states,

---

[130] Psellus, Michael. Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. pp.224-5.
[131] Ibid., p.203.

> "One of the rebels, who knew how to shoot arrows from horseback, came near the wall without our knowledge and drawing his bow right opposite the emporer shot straight at him. The arrow sped through the air at tremendous speed, but Constantine moves slightly to one side and it slightly missed him [...] The emperor just shifted his seat and took up a position farther away from the enemy troop (still on the balcony). The emperor, after he had recovered his self-composure, thought it would be disgraceful if he did not get together some soldiers to oppose them [...]" [132]

Although not a soldier, one can see very well how little disturbs the emperor's iron nerve. This scene lets us know also that the emperor has no thoughts of letting go the reins of empire. History tells us that when he set out to do something, he did it and effectively. Rebellions were crushed and Constantine died apparently of natural causes.

In comparison with the Byzantine state, it can be said that everything is exactly the same, yet totally different. Where Constantine was a courtier-emperor Danilo was a soldier-ruler. This is in itself not a bad thing, even Psellus states: "The people loathed him (Constantine IX) as a ruler and wanted to see a soldier-emperor, a man who would endanger his own life on their behalf and put an end to barbarian incursions." [133] Maybe even Psellus would have approved more of Leo, as we know already his beliefs on defence of the empire but like all people, sometimes, a personal prejudice can come through, and Psellus states that Leo Tornicius[134] "reeked of Macedonian arrogance" and this was a very bad thing in Pseelus' eyes.

---

[132] Ibid., p.213-4.
[133] Ibid., p.209-10.
[134] It is interesting to note that Psellus states on p.205 of Fourteen Byzantine Rulers, that Leo was Constantine Monomachus' second cousin, and that the internecine strife which the author of the GVC condemned was also prevalent in the court of Constantinople.
As well, in an appendix to the Fourteen Byzantine Rulers, Sewter draws attention to the family tree of the great Basil II and Constantine VIII and his favorite augusta Zoe, and that they all come from Macedonian lineage

As we turn to the personal bravery/ endurability of Danilo Romanovič we see no less bravery. The GVC states, "Although Danilo was very young he showed his valour in battle: both Danilo and Gleb Zeremejevič fought the whole night, in the morning Gleb Vasilevič caught up with Danilo, but Danilo turned around to attack him and pursued him for more than a *poprišče* (2/3 of a mile)."[135] In another instance Danilo had engaged the Tatar armies and it says, "Danilo himself was wounded in his chest, but because of his youth and impetuousness he did not feel the wounds on his body: he was eighteen and strong as a bull. Danilo fought fiercely and slew many Tatars." [136] Again, we have Danilo quoting from the Scriptures (which are really, the Alexandria) [137], "He who hesitates to do battle is a cowardly soul." And thus urging them on he hurriedly descended upon the enemy. When the Hungarians saw Danilo, they did not wish to do battle with him (and attacked someone else instead, so Danilo jumped into the fray anyway) [...] "Danilo struck a soldier with his spear and when it broke, he drew his sword." [138] In the entry under 1233/34 the author of the GVC states, "Danilo had been at war from the Epiphany to the Ascension [...]" [139] In this episode, Danilo had just made peace and was headed home to rest when one of the Kievan princes asked him for help against the Polovcian armies. When the fighting began to get serious Danilo said, "It does not behoove a soldier who has set out to do battle to turn back. He should either be victorious or killed by the enemy. I tried to restrain you, but now I see that you have timid hearts. Did I not tell you that tired soldiers should not march against fresh troops? Why are you afraid now? Go and attack

---

[135] Pritsak, Omeljan. ed. The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. pp.25-6.
[136] Ibid., p.29.
[137] Actually, it is the "Alexandria". Ibid., p.135.
[138] Ibid., p.40-1.
[139] Ibid., p.43.

them!" [140] And against all odds, he did. Although the outcome was short of victorious, the Galician prince remained unscathed and went home to rest. There are many other examples of Danilo's bravery and rhetoric that could prove this point, but the two best examples that could be used are not in battle - physically but more in a spiritual/ philosophical level - much like Constantine IX Monomachus. The first is when he has to go to Khan Batyj at his camp on the Volga to settle a dispute over his patrimony in Galicia. The GVC tells us,

> "Emperors, princes, and nobles, who came - all were led around a bush to worship the sun, the moon, the earth, and the Devil, as well a their deceased fathers, grandfathers and mothers who were all in hell. There was a vassal of Jaroslav Vsevlodovič called Songur then approached him and suggested that since Danilo's 'brother' Jaroslav had worshipped a bush he should also. But Danilo replied that the Devil was speaking through his lips and that God would shut them so that no one would hear what he said. And at that moment he was summoned by Batyj and thus delivered by God from their godless devilry and sorcery." [141]

One must never think that this was an easy thing to do, as the GVC records, "Jaroslav the great prince of Suzdal', was poisoned and Mixail, the prince of Černigov, who would not worship the bush was stabbed to death with a knife together with his boyar Fedor." [142] The accomplishment of his personal bravery is heralded by the GVC chronicler when he states, "Soon the news that Danilo had returned from the Tatars and that God had brought him back safely spread to all lands." [143] Knowing Danilo's connections, it staggers the imagination that the Polovcians, Rus'ians, Hungarians, Germans, Poles and the Vatican waited to hear what happened to this one Rus'ian prince. The last example of Danilo's

---

[140] Ibid., p.43.
[141] Ibid., p.58.
[142] Ibid., p.58.
[143] Ibid., p.59.

'personal best' is very much a parallel of what the soothsayers prophesied in Monomachus' case. Danilo in this situation is entirely involved in the third party as is apparent from the quote of the Tatars in the entry dated 1254, regarding Danilo's reputation as a ruler and soldier. The GVC records that four years before Danilo's retirement, Izjaslav Mstislavič of Smolensk requested aid from the Tatars in his campaign against Halyč. They replied to this request, "How can you campaign against Halyč? Danilo is a fierce prince; if he should wish to kill you who will save you then?" [144] A great compliment coming from the conquerors of all of the nations on the Great Eurasian Plain. Not much more really can be said about the personal bravery or edurability of Danilo, as it stands with the best of the Byzantine rulers and, in particular, Psellus' favorite.

The next section of Ljubarskij's in his dissection of Psellus' work is the quality of governing or ruling ability. This is, in some respects, a very subjective matter depending on what is considered governing and its details. Some could consider quality as measured in terms of army, others in terms of imperial treasury, and yet others in the life style of the inhabitants of the empire, and yet another group measures its ruling qualities by the number of edifices and orchards and fields and what belongs to the Church. It can be seen that as even as much as Psellus loves the soldier-emperor type, he knows that one characteristic cannot dominate exclusively and that there must be a golden mean in all aspects of an emperor's rule. We are already aware of Psellus' view of the reign of Basil II from earlier in this chapter and we know that his army was most formidable and that the royal treasury was enlarged and even overflowed from the conquests of the army. Strangely enough, an emperor is a person who rules over peoples, nations, and tongues. This is an empire. A

---

[144] Ibid., p.69.

banker rules over money and a general rules over soldiers. So, where does this take us? It takes us to the ones who look after their subjects while still keeping in mind the first two necessities, for without the conquest there is no booty and no tribute, without this there is no imperial treasury, and with an empty treasury you have a bankrupt empire and bankrupt empires do not and cannot look after their citizens. So, thanks to Basil II we will see some fruits come about from his labour. In this instance we look to Michael IV and Psellus writes,

> "In fact, a considerable part of the imperial treasury was set aside for the foundation of monasteries and nunneries throughout the continent. A new hospice was built too, called by him the *Ptochotropheium* (Hospice for Beggars) and in this was a mighty stream of gold poured out for those who preferred a life of meditation. One idea followed another, and among other schemes he devised a plan for the salvation of lost souls. Scattered over the city was a vast multitude of harlots [...] Then in the stentorian notes of the public herald, he issued a proclamation: all women who trafficked in their beauty, provided they were to renounce their trade and live in luxury, were to find sanctuary in this building: all fear of poverty would be banished from their lives for ever [...] Thereupon a great swarm of prostitutes descended upon the refuge [...]" [145]

Similar and yet different accomplishments were found under Constantine IX as Psellus speaks of Constantine's constant horticultural and agronomical activities. Psellus states,

> "The emperor devoted some time to amusements, and while to other men 'amusement', however they regarded it, had only one connotation, To him it was a serious business, invested with dignity. If he wished to make a grove, or to fence a park or to flatten a race-course, it was not sufficient to carry out the plan as he had first conceived it. New ideas at once occured to him. As some men covered the meadows with soil, others were fencing them round (all

[145] Psellus, Michael. Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. pp.107-8.

> with the greatest expedition); vines and trees were rooted up, but others immediately took their place, already loaded with fruit. How was it done? Well, suppose the emperor wanted to transform a barren plain into a fertile, productive field. No time was lost. Trees which were growing elsewhere were transported to the plain complete with their fruit, and planted in the earth there; clods of soil covered with grass, brought from mountain groves were spread all over it." [146]

We know from an earlier section that Constantine IX was a fair and benevolent judge over his people.[147] Many good and talented people were appointed to offices because of their competence and his judgement of character and ability to delegate. [148] Constantine kept the company of intellectuals to keep him on the path of continuing education[149] Psellus also refers to Monomachus' success in diplomacy which guaranted peace for his citizens to enjoy the pleasures that were built for them. [150]

We have seen the Byzantine emperors at peace, but what about a Rus'ian prince who seems to be almost constantly at war? For Danilo there was some time of peace and even he was busy with building and expanding for the betterment of his people. The GVC author writes,

> "While Danilo was reigning in Volodimer', he founded the city of Ugrovesk and placed a bishop in it. Then one day he was out hunting in the field, he saw a beautiful wooded place on a hill surrounded by a field, and asked the local inhabitants what this place was called. They replied that it was called Xolm. He liked this place and planned to build a small town on it, promising God and St. John Chrysostom that he would build a church in the saint's name. When Prince Danilo saw that God placed Xolm under His protection, he began to invite immigrants - Germans, Rus'ians, and all kinds of

[146] Ibid., p.246.
[147] Ibid., pp.244-5.
[148] Ibid., pp.228, 248.
[149] Ibid., pp254-7.
[150] Ibid., p.253.

> foreigners, and Poles - to the city. Day after day they came - young people and artisans as, for example, saddle, bow, and quiver craftsmen and iron- , copper- , and silver-smiths who had escaped from regions under Tatar occupation. Thus life began to pulsate and the households, that field, and villages around the city grew rich. Then Danilo built the beautiful and majestic church of St. John. There were four vaults - one vault from each end - which rested on four human heads... and three windows adorned with Roman glass. At the entrance there stood two pillars made entirely of stone which supported another vault. The ceiling was decorated with gold stars against a sky-blue background, while the floor within the church was cast of copper and pure tin so that it shone like a mirror [...] every-one who looked at the great church marvelled its great beauty." [151]

As one looks at history and we move from one sphere of influence to another we see that as a ruler and comander of armies and soldiers he was able to harness this ability even in the civilian world. He built himself a new capital and made it a (materially, culturally, and spiritually) rich city. Given the magnitude and scale of rule, no one could say that Danilo Romanovič was a worse statesman than the Byzantine emperors at any stage of his career, or theirs.

The last category in the list of Ljubarskij's is in the East Slavic - '*um*'. I have taken it upon myself to translate this in a broader sense. The reason being that intelligence is not something that one gets from a book or can it be passed down by a teacher. As in Greek, Fate in Slavic is feminine [moira, sud'ba, Greek and Slavic respectively, drawing attention to the -a endings] and personified she can be a good teacher and companion to the student of life. Many of the emperors had come to power after a long, rocky, and winding road and mostly uphill. This is why - '*um*', is translated as life skills. It would be in this arena that each of the emperors, Danilo included, would have learned all of the aforementioned

---

[151] Pritsak, Omeljan. ed. The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. p.75.

characteristics, yes, even family and background if we look back to Michael IV and his encomium. One will notice that the comparisons have been drawn as such and the liberty taken in translating and interpreting the term 'um' because of the typological similarities between Danilo and Constantine IX. This has been done in the light of Ljubarskij's article and the universality of application that has been used throughout this chapter. If one looks closely, one sees that in both cases there was a great amount of potential for each of these men as children and youths, only to be taken away by forces beyond their control; upon entering manhood, it was their fate to regain what was theirs by inheritance or prophesy only by hard work, blood and sweat, forging the ruler/hero that is found in history. This is what makes a hero significant in this instance.

Here we will look again to the emperor that makes up the bulk of the chronicle to get a glimpse of his life skills.

> "Because of his family this man [Monomachus] held very high rank in the Empire. In the first place he became a son-in-law to the outstanding member of court society, but his wife fell ill and died. He was forced into a second 'alliance'. At this time, Romanus the future emporer [...] conceived a deep affection for Constantine [...] Alliance with this family [Sclerus] conferred on the man extraordinary brilliance, but he still held no important office. Basil's advisors, because of the hatred they nursed for the father, vented their spite on the son [...] That was the reason neither Basil nor his brother Constantine ever promoted him to any responsible post in the government. Even the accession of Romanus did little to help Constantine in his career. However, Romanus did at least keep him at the imperial court, and if for no other cause, he was very much in the public eye through his near relations with the emperor. His fresh complexion (to the men of our generation he was unspoiled as spring fruit) and his graceful manners and his conversation, in which he excelled all others, were things that won the heart of the empress. She delighted in his company again and again. Michael [Romanus' successor] viewed him [Constantine] with suspicion. Later, he trumped up false accusations, suborning witnesses

> unjustly, his punishment was relegation to a certain determined area, in this case the island of Mitylene, and there for seven years - the exact length of Michael's reign. Michael Calaphates, like Paphlagon, inherited the emperor's hatred of the young man. [152]

Psellus uses a phrase when talking about the life of Monomachus, "he endured his misfortune". Psellus tells us why the emperor ruled the empire as he did, "Constantine looked upon the palace as a harbour, in which he had taken refuge after much buffeting by the waves in a storm - and to recompense him for the past, he needed complete rest and absolute tranquility. "[153] Again, as we look back on the deeds of Constantine IX life we see how he dealt with what life gave him and how it translated into actuality during his rule.

On the other hand we have Danilo, the son of Roman, the great-grandson of Volodimer Monomax. Given his family background, we see that Danilo was destined for something great. But fate has a way of tempering into the finest steel lives that may otherwise have been soft and easily broken. So, in this case, we see that upon the death of their father in 1201, chaos reigned in the life of Danilo and his brother. "Princess Anna immediately held council with Miroslav - the tutor of her children - and when night fell, they fled to Poland: The tutor left the city with Danilo in his arms while their father-confessor Jurii accompanied by the children's nurse took Vasilko and fled through a hole in the city walls." [154] If Danilo was carried off in the arms of the tutor he could not have been very old, and Vasilko is his younger brother. We then learn why they went to Poland. In 1203 the GVC states, "Prince Lestko sent Danilo to Hungary [...] He (Hungarian King Andrej/Andrew) kept Danilo by his side while the princess (Anna) and Vasilko stayed

---

[152] Psellus, Michael. Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. pp.162-4.
[153] Ibid., p.172-3.
[154] Pritsak, Omeljan. ed. The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. p.18.

with Lestko."[155] This all of course being instigated on the death of their father and the power vacuum that had to be filled. "After some time the Galicians brought back the Kormilicič boyars, whom the Great Prince Roman had banished for their treason: they had extolled the Igorevič princes. Upon their advice the boyars of Halyč summoned the Igorevic princes to come rule over them. They placed Prince Volodimer Igorevič in Halyč [...]" [156] The GVC tells us that Danilo regained Halyč and started to rule, being installed by force. The GVC author states, "When Prince Danilo began his reign in Halyč, he was so young that he did not recognize his mother for he had been separated for several years." [157] After living like a princely nomad, coming and going from one court to another, living amongst soldiers and warriors and more importantly, probably wishing to live in the image of his father Roman. The GVC states, "After some time had passed the Galicians drove Danilo's mother out of Halyč. Danilo did not wish to be left without her and cried for her, because he was very young. Then Sumavinskyj's servant - Oleksander - rode up and took Danilo's horse by its bridle. But Danilo unsheathed his sword, struck him and killed his horse beneath him." [158] It probably is no mistake then that Kotljar and Smolij when titling one of their articles on Danilo entitled it "Roždenyj v kolčuge" [159] ["Born in Chainmail", S.R.E.]. Thus, describing in a very concise summary the spirit or code by which Danilo lived and was forced to live having grown up in the courts of Europe under Western influences, yet desiring to keep the traditions of Rus' alive. One reason for this ethno-desire is fact that his mother was Polish and hence felt at ease in Poland and the West whereas his father was of the house of Volhynia and Kiev and a native Rus'ian. Danilo,

---

[155] Ibid., p.19.
[156] Ibid., p.18.
[157] Ibid., p.22.
[158] Ibid., p.22.

being deprived of his father and a father figure at a young age and having heard a lifetime of stories about the greatness of his father and his forefathers, there can be no doubt about the desire of Danilo to keep alive the traditions of Rus'. It is not for nothing that the author of the GVC states, "He went to the Church of the Blessed Virgin, fell down on his knees and and worshipped God, glorifying Him for everything that happened, for no other prince of Rus' had made war upon the Czech land," [160] implying that not even his father or Volodimer Monomax had or could accomplish this. The sum total of experiences in his early life, one could say, led Danilo and put him at an advantage to rule. As he saw and experienced life, dealt with people and learned how to rule and command from the best in Eastern Europe (he learned his trade from older, wiser and experienced kings, princes and generals) in a time of almost constant warfare. This was the tempering process by which we have come to recognize the GVC and its central hero, making the GVC interesting from a socio-psychological aspect as well. These are the skills that Danilo used to their fullest throughout his entire lifetime. The differences between Danilo and Constantine really are in setting only, for both lived extreme, tumultuous lives that in retrospect would bring glory to their rule for the benefit of those that were subject to them and those that would study them in the future.

In this chapter we examined the greatest of the Byzantine emporers that Michael Psellus could offer us. We then used for comparison the central figure of the GVC, coming from the Galician portion of the chronicle. Using the methodology of Ja. N. Ljubarskij as the vehicle by which it is possible to move these two diversely, linguistically, culturally and stylistically different chronicles together in a united movement. Many

---

[159] Kotljar, H.F. and V.A. Smolij. Istorija v žizneopisanijax. Kiev: Naukova dumka. pp.97-110.

parallels were drawn and were it not for Ljubarskij's methodology, it would make these chronicles extremely incommensurable. We are indebted to the universality of Ljubarskij's article. The parallels drawn tell us exactly that the characteristics that form the historical hero (istoričeskij geroj) in a Byzantine sense can and will be used to draw out the hero in (classical) medieval Slavic literature. The Ljubarskij variable can do so and has done so. Although there really should not be a surprise that Ljubarskij's work did work. Since the problem is medieval literature, the formula that we used was Byzantine studies, the resulting answer gives us the possibility of solving more textual and poetical problems found in medieval Slavic literature whem compared with a similar Byzantine text.

---

[160] Pritsak, Omeljan. ed. The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. p.67.

Chapter 3

Nothing could be more true more than that which Riccardo Picchio said in his article "The Function of Biblical Thematic Clues in the Literary Code of 'Slavia Orthodoxa'."

> "One would expect that modern students in Medieval Slavic literature would have devoted most of their critical efforts to the study of this problem [How did the writers of Slavia Othodoxa create their works]. Curiously enough this does not seem to be the case, at least if we examine the current surveys of Medieval Russian, Serbian or Bulgarian literary history. This deficiency may be explained as a result of a wide spread inclination among too many modern scholars to conceive 'literature' as the free expression of 'creative imagination'. It has been believed for a long time that nothing of real literary value could be produced by writers of Medieval Slavic works because of their submissive acceptance of pre-established ideas and formulae. Because of this critical attitude many students of Eastern and South Slavic Medieval literature have tried to deny either the predominance of religious dogmatism in these works or their literary significance. In both cases the function of what we may call the poetics of Medieval Orthodox Slavic dogmatic tradition could not become a primary object of investigation." [161]

It has now been over two decades since Picchio wrote this article and it is still just as difficult to get many people to accept this argument even though reality shows the truthfulness of the author's thesis.

The question that Picchio had asked earlier is one of vital importance to us here. The question-how did the writers of Slavia Orthodoxa create their works-has to be answered in order to better understand our hypothesis. Picchio himself deals with the question very concisely,

> "Did they actually follow precise rules of rhetoric and poetics or did they simply rely on the practical imitation of authoritative models?

---

[161] Picchio, Riccardo. "The Function of Biblical Thematic Clues in the Literary Code of 'Slavia Orthodoxa'." Slavica Hierosolymitana: University of Jerusalem 1, 1977. p.4.

> Any attempt to answer these crucial questions, which would inevitably mean tackling a number of other technical problems, is seriously hampered by the lack of Medieval Orthodox Slavic works dealing with the theory of literature. It seems therefore advisable to look for factual piece of evidence in the texts. Since we don't know exactly which literary devices the Orthodox Slavic writers were supposed to use, we should first find out to what extent Orthodox Slavic writing seems to be affected by the actual use of any formal device. By combining our general knowledge of the ideological sources of Orthodox Slavic literature with the data that may be elicited through the structural and formal analysis of the texts, we may reach a fairly accurate description of the principles that Orthodox Slavic writers used in their works. We know that the Old and the New Testaments were supreme models of writing as well as sacred sources of intellectual inspiration." [162]

What can be said now that can add more to this, is this not the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle? The idea that Picchio set forward in the opening quotes had us dealing directly with the literary value of the GVC and most importantly, with the image of the ruler in Rus' being focused on the protagonist of the Galician half of the Chronicle Danilo Romanovič. It is precisely the reason for which this is being undertaken, that we are dealing with the first quote of Picchio's. The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle has great depth of literary style and function that is very worthwhile looking into. The second quote of Picchio's that warrants our attention is the concept of biblical thematic clues that lead us to a greater reckoning and understanding of the poetics and rhetoric of 13th century Rus'.

Another methodology that we will need to use in the understanding of the image of the ruler in Rus' is put forward by Sergei Averincev in his article "Porjadok kosmosa i porjadok istorii v mirovozzrenii rannego srednevekov'ja".[163] ["The Order of the Cosmos and the Order of History in the World-view of the Early Middle-ages."] Averincev puts forward succinctly and concretely the argument that in Medieval literature it is the author's

---

[162] Ibid., p.4.

necessity to understand all earthly occurrences in light of the Divine. Averincev states at the beginning of the article that in the Greek *kosmos* means order/harmony and the order of the order can only be seen in the light of the Divine. Averincev clearly puts forward that it was Byzantine society that made this possible. It was their understanding of the hierarchy, military, and religion that created a cosmological formalism that could not have existed in the time of Plato [164] To reiterate, Averincev is talking about the Byantine-medieval, or simply Biblical concept that there is a divine plan in heaven and that things on earth are to be seen in terms of type and anti-type.

Now, having said this, and Holy Scripture being our key to understanding the literary value of the chronicle, then we must open up the Bible to the Book of Daniel. It is obvious that the major methodology we are using is Picchio's "Function of Biblical Thematic Clues" , and so it is again, obviously necessary to use the Bible. The Book of Daniel was chosen because of its parallels; as we see, the names of the two heroes in each of our stories are Daniel. The books are both central to episodes in the lives of these two Daniels and there are many parallels in the great feats accomplished in the lives of these two Daniels. This having been said, it is obviously still not enough to convince one of the poetical underpinnings, while we have established a certain amount of semantic evidence. The evidence and reasoning will come in its own time. The evidence starts off with the unlikely story in the founding of the city of Xolm. [165]The GVC author writes,

> "While Danilo was reigning in Volodimer', he founded the city of Ugrovesk and placed a bishop in it. Then one day he was out

---

[163] See pp.54-5 of this work for the full quote.
[164] Averincev, S.S. "Porjadok kosmosa i porjadok istorii v mirovozzrenii rannego srednevekov'ja." pp.268-9.
[165] Quoted above in chapter 2 of this work.

hunting in the field, he saw a beautiful wooded place on a hill surrounded by a field, and asked the local inhabitants what this place was called. They replied that it was called Xolm. He liked this place and planned to build a small town on it, promising God and St.John Chrysostom that he would build a church in the saint's name. When Prince Danilo saw that God placed Xolm under His protection, he began to invite immigrants - Germans, Rus'ians, and all kinds of foreigners, and Poles - to the city. Day after day they came - young people and artisans as, for example, saddle, bow, and quiver craftsmen and iron- , copper- , and silver-smiths who had escaped from regions under Tatar occupation. Thus life began to pulsate and the households, that field, and villages around the city grew rich. Then Danilo built the beautiful and majestic church of St. John. There were four vaults - one vault from each end - which rested on four human heads... and three windows adorned with Roman glass. At the entrance there stood two pillars made entirely of stone which supported another vault. The ceiling was decorated with gold stars against a sky-blue background, while the floor within the church was cast of copper and pure tin so that it shone like a mirror... every-one who looked at the great church marvelled its great beauty." [166]

We see in this the importance of St. John Chrysostom. A very prolific writer and moralist of the fourth century, being one of the great Nicaean Fathers. His writings are loved by the Church, both East and West. We see that Danilo promised to God and St. John to build a city on the place where Danilo was hunting. Having built the city, he then set to work on building the church that was to be dedicated to St. John. We see that according to the word of the author the church was considered a "wonder" of architecture and art in the eastern world. This sentiment is reiterated in the article by A.A. Pautkin called, "Sozda grad imenem Xolm" [167], where he goes into a detailed explanation of the building of the city and its centerpiece, the church of St. John Chrysostom. This is important for us in two aspects, the first being that John Chrysostom was a prolific writer. The second fact that is important

---

[166] Pritsak, Omeljan. ed. The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. p.75.
[167] Pautkin, A.A. "Sozda grad imenem Xolm." Ruskaja Rec', (1) 1989.

for us is that he had a church named in his honour and it was the church that was the show piece of Xolm. It is also important in another respect because mentioned earlier by the Ukrainian academic Ja. D Isaevyč, that Xolm was being built as second Kiev and as St. Sofia is important in the history of Kiev, so would St. John's be in Xolm. It is also important to try to understand, why St. John Chrysostom and not St. John the Revelator, or the Theologian, or St. John the Baptist, but Chrysostom. This is why it is so important to understand the influence that St. John Chrysostom had on Christianity and Eastern Christianity in particular. So, it was very fortuitous, while searching the Polnoe sobranie tvorenij svjatogo otca našego Ioanna Zlatousta for some commentaries on the Epistle to the Romans and the Gospel of John, the commentary on the Book of Daniel was found. In Chrysostom's commentary there were parallels that seemed to agree with the GVC's encounter on the Volga between Danilo and Khan Batu. The possibility exists that the author of the GVC had in mind Chrysostom's Daniel when he was writing the account of Danilo meeting with Khan Batu. As we look to the text in the commentary of the Book of Daniel we notice that in his first chapter, Chrysostom makes the parallel between Daniel and King David, Jacob (Israel), Joseph and even Abraham. In many of the parallel passages of the GVC there seemed to be typological ties with these personages. [168] Although it may not be exactly so, it is possible that the author of the GVC did have Chrysostom's commentary in mind when writing his account of the events that had taken place. One such major parallel is the fact that Bishop Ivan was the bishop in charge of that church of St. John Chrysostom, secondly, there were many treaties, political ties, and

[168] Ioann Zlatoust. Polnoe sobranie tvorenij svjatogo otca našego Ioanna Zlatousta. rektor akademii, Boris, episkop Jamburgskij. S.-Peterburg: S.-Peterburgskajaj Duxovnaja Akademia, 1900. T.6, kniga 1. p.496.

cultural exchange that were between Halyč and Constantinople. This is, of course, some amount of speculation, at least on the political side but there does appear to be a logical enough of a connection to warrant such a speculation.

What do the academic sources say about the influence of the Book of Daniel in Rus'? The one major work undertaken on this subject was written by the Russian academician Ivan Evseev. He states that the full text of Daniel appears in the Gennady Bible in 1499. [169] Although, he says that the Book of Daniel was found in the Izbornik Svjatoslava of 1073. [170] In finding evidence for the pre-existence of the Book of Daniel in Rus' we look again to the pages of Evsejev's book, where he states, "Kniga Daniila v spiskax tolkovyx proročestv ètoj redakcii soxranilas' bez tolkovanii, no, kak ukažem niže, perevedena ona byla v to že samoe vremja I, verojatno, toju že rukoju i s tolkovaniem sv. Ippolita. Nauke èta redakcija izvestna davno. Vostokov pol'zovalsja tolkovymi proročestvami dlja svoego slovarja i otnosil ix po jazyku k IX v." [171] Evseev continues, "V XIII v. ona projavljaetsja v dvux punktax: u slavjan jugo-zapadnyx i v zapadnoj Rusi. [172] It seems to much of a coincidence that the influence of the Book of Daniel in the west of Rus' would be seen around the same time as the start of the GVC. In his introduction Evseev brings one point to the forefront for us, "I v našem izdanii, na rjadu s slavjanskimi tekstami trex redakcij, my predlagaem sootvetstvujuščij im grečeskij original - dve grečeskie redakcii knigi Daniila - konstantinopl'skuju i aleksandrijskuju IV v."[173] He then states further, "[...] tolkovanijam na kn. Daniila sv. Ippolita rimskago [is found in] (5

---

[169] Evseev, Ivan. Kniga proroka Daniila v drevne-slavjanskom perevode. Moscow: Imp. AN. 1905. p.48.
[170] Ibid., p.33.
[171] Ibid., p.32.
[172] Ibid., p.46.
[173] Ibid., p.7.

spiskov) i častiju inym (4 spiska), vsego 9 spiskov XII - XVII vv."[174] It is important for our evidence that we can find the connection with the commentary genre, and then tie this into the larger picture. He states further: "[...] Pervonačal'naja škola v proročeskix knigax opiraetsja na grečeskij original konstantinoplskoj redakcii, vtoraja že peredaet grečeskuju redakciju aleksandrijskuju."[175] The understanding of these things comes down to the eschatological level and, in a sense, a political level. Evseev writes further on this subject,

> "Pri takom uslovii perevod ètot ne mog byt' slučajnym po svoemy vypolneniju: ne mog byt' soveršen po usmotreniju missionera s pervoj slučajnoj, popavšejsja pod ruki na polke bogusložebnoj knigi, a dolžen byl točno soobrazovatsja s cerkovnymi potrebnostjami i praktikoj velikoj konstanstinopol'skoj cerkvi. Potrebnosti èti i praktika nastojalo trebovali knigi, neobxodimoj pri bogusluženii i, razumeetsja, v tom ee vide, v kakom upotrebljalas' ona v carstvujuščem Konstantinopole." [176]

Evseev's own view on the influence of the Book of Daniel in the Slavic world come through Hippolytus of Rome as he states, "Kniga Daniila v spiskax tolkovyx proročestv ètoj redakcii soxranilas' bez tolkovanij, no, kak ukažem niže, perevedena ona byla v to že samoe vremja I, verojatno, toju že rukoju i s tolkovaniem sv. Ippolita [177]. Nauke èta redakcija izvestna davno. Vostokov pol'zovalsja tolkovymi proročestvami dlja svoego slovarja i otnosil ix po jazyku v IX v."[178] But, as a first class academic he leaves nothing out of his equation and takes this information into account, "Tret'e tolkovanie - raskol'ničeskoe. Napravleno ono k vyjasneniju na osnovanii kniga Daniila voprosa ob

---

[174] Ibid., p.9.
[175] Ibid., p.10.
[176] Ibid., p.11.
[177] Found in the Izbornik Svjatoslava 1073 goda is a piece of work attributed to Hippolytus of Rome. The discourse runs two full columns and covers all of leaf 163 (a). The topic of the work deals with Daniel's faithfulness and understanding as the angel Gabriel makes it known to him.

antixriste. Po sostavu ono sbornoe: otryvki iz tolkovanij Ippolita soedineny s otryvkami iz Prologa, Zlatousta i drugix perevodnyx istočnikov." [179] While Evseev in his very educated and logical opinion has chosen Hippolytus of Rome as his all encompassing example of the commentary on the Book of Daniel he still does not entirely discount the possibility of St. John Chrysostom. He then goes on to say later,

> "Sopostavlennie pervogo roda spiskov s tekstom Daniila u Zlatousta po Minju opravdalo naši predpoloženija: čtenija Daniila 2:27; 4:1; 5:1 sovpali polnostiju, i tol'ko v 8:4 u Minja dana pribavka "xai noton", ne našedšaja sebe sootvetstvija v 7 spiskax Parsonza. V ostal'nyx mestax Daniila sravnenie bylo nevozmožno, potomu čto v edinstvennom izvestnom dosele spiske tolkovanij Zlatousta na Daniila, izdannom u Minja, svjaščennyja čtenija proročeskago teksta privedeny v ves'ma ukoročennom vide."[180]

Does this then make our case hopeless or not worth pursuing? Not at all, for Evsejev also states, "Kniga pr. Daniila v ètoj redakcii malo prigodna dlja nabljudenij po označennomu voprosu. Istorija ee teksta do XV v. soveršenno neizvestna." [181] In historical agreement with this idea of the unknown, the GVC author states, "When Danilo saw the great damage which his city and the Church of St. John suffered as a result of the fire, he grieved greatly. After praying to God, he built the church anew and had Bishop Ivan bless it. Then he prayed to God again and rebuilt the city this time making it much stronger and surrounded it with higher walls." [182] Speaking logically, one never knows how much Chrysosotom based his work on that of Hippolytus of Rome or how the two of these interact, as we read,

---

[178] Ibid., p.32.
[179] Ibid., p.51.
[180] Ibid., p.76. N.B. While researching in the Izbornik Svjatoslava 1073 goda: Naučnyj apparat faksimil'nogo izdanija. Moscow: Kniga. 1983. (otv. red. E.A. Smirnova, *et al.*) pp.41-57. One can not help but notice that vast number of entries that are attributed to St. John Chrysostom, although there is no mention by him of any writing on the Book of Daniel, one could see the possibility of Chrysostom's influence in the Izbornik 1073 and hence in Rus' in what is already the 11th century.
[181] Ibid., p.34.

Xolm was burnt to the ground and any information that could have been there was probably in all reality lost. What we do have before us is the concrete fact that the Book of Daniel was found in Western Rus' (contemporary Belarus and Ukraine) at the time of the GVC and it seems that the author had in mind the making of a proto-typical hero of the GVC and probabilities seem to lead one to the Book of Daniel. It would seem that history, culture, architecture, religion and politics open the way for the idea of the influence of the Book of Daniel in Rus', and that in particular it could seem to be that this came via the commentary of St. John Chrysostom. An overview of the commentary will provide an excellent background from which to start. The first chapter deals with the exile of the young men, the physical and spiritual characteristics of Daniel. Chrysostom then goes on to compare him with Joseph, Moses, Jacob, Abraham, Nathaniel (the prophet) and David. In this analysis St. John also talks about the importance of names for people. Chapter two deals with the topic that Daniel learns from his captors, yet does not accept their customs. His faith in God advances him materially and spiritually, making him a master of his masters. In chapter three Chrysostom deals with the fact that God keeps Daniel safe from harm in so much as he is not even tested. And, how the faith of the three young men advances them both materially and spiritually (Holy Saturday). Chapter four talks about the subject of true evangelization. How it is possible for the "biggest" of the heathen to come to a conscious acceptance and worship of God (Nativity of Jesus Christ). Chapter five deals with the conviction of sin. Chrysostom in this case uses blasphemers, drunkards and idolators and how they will glorify God's people even when they have no inclination to do so. Chapter six is yet another test of the faith of Daniel that is a lesson in faith and

---

[182] Pritsak, Omeljan. ed. The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. p.76.

evangelization. Chrysostom also compares the lion's den of Daniel's punishment to the grave of Christ. In chapter seven St. John preaches humility, prayer and fasting as a way for God to open his plan to the individual. He mentions also how one is to know the Antichrist. Chapter eight is an anti-Jewish tract, marking the follies of the Hebrew people. Chapter nine compares Daniel with Moses, in his humility Daniel like Moses was always glorified. In chapter ten, St. John continues to extol the virtue of humility and faithfulness found in Daniel. As well, he deals with the theme of the protection of God's people. Chapter eleven talks about the future salvation and glory of Daniel's people. Chapter twelve reinforces the Christian title of prophet and Danielís knowledge of the future of history.

Having examined the material, we then must open up the GVC. From the very first entries it only becomes too obvious, that the protagonist-hero is none other than Prince Danilo (Daniel). Even those who might not be very initiated in biblical themes are sure to recognize the name Daniel and be able to place one of the many stories written about him. But, if it should be that he is unknown to the reader then it will become very apparent what is the connection between the two.

The first of these comparisons is the easiest. We know immediately that Danilo is a prince, as it is stated that his father was the Great Prince Roman the unforgettable Autocrat of all of Rus'. [183] Here one could easily imply, that through his lineage he would have to be a prince, but if this is insufficient due to doubt because of non-legitimacy, then the text of the GVC itself settles the problem, for in the tenth [184] entry the Chronicle states, "While

---

[183] Ibid., p.17.
[184] Dukan, Zak. Stenanie zemli. (trans. I Makarceva) Istočnik žizni: Moscow. 1995, p.299.

[Prince] Danilo was in Hungary, King Andrej [Andrew], who had no son, the Hungarian boyars and the whole land wanted to give Andrej's [Andrew's] daughter in marriage to Prince Danilo, although both were children." [185] The same could be said of Daniel from the Bible, for although it mentions him, it takes a while to figure out his position or rank. The Bible text reads, "Then the king instructed Ashpenaz, the master of his eunuchs, to bring some of the children of Israel and some of the king's descendants and some of the nobles [...] Now from among the sons of Judah were Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah." [186] In his commentary on the Book of Daniel, Old Testament scholar and Doctor of Hebrew/Jewish philology Jacques Doukhan says, "po pribytii evrejskix plenikov v Vavilon imi srazu že zanjalis' carskie činovniki. Asfenazu, načal'niku evnuxov, bylo poručeno proizvesti sredi nix predvaritel'nyj otbor. Molodye ljudi carskogo roda..." [187] This doesn't say much but at the end of this quote, on the word 'roda' Doukhan supplies a footnote of great interest. Here Doukhan stated, "Dan. 1:3; soglasno tradicii, Daniil byl potomkom carja Sedekii (Iosif Flavij, Iudejskie drevnosti, X, 10,1)." [188] Here Doukhan also quotes, not only Joseph Flavius, but even the Talmud to strengthen the argument.[189] The evidence shows fairly concretely that both of our heroes are of courtly lineage. As we

---

In Jewish thought, the semantic meaning of the number 10 has very serious implications. It is symbolized by the letter (jod) the smallest letter, yet its meaning carries the idea of test, trial or ordeal. This makes two points the first being, the semantic significance of Danilo being raised in the court of a Western king and how does he deal with it in relation to his Rus'ian roots, being born of the house of Volhynian Volodimer and Kiev. The second point lies within the field of N.A. Meščerskij and his work on Hebraic studies and Hebrew original texts and their use in Rus. cf. Meščerskij, N. A. Istočniki i sostav drevnej slavjano-russkoj perevodnoj pis'mennosti IX -XV vekov. LGU, 1978. p.47.

[185] Pritsak, Omeljan. ed. The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. p.20.

[186] Dan. 1:3-4..

[187] Dukan, Zak. Stenanie zemli. p.24.

[188] Ibid., p.299.

[189] Ibid., p.299.

shall yet see this is only the first in a number of related sequences that establish the ties between the two princes.

It is also very beneficial for us, too, when Picchio states, "Since the 'true meaning,' that is, the spiritual sense of a verbal expression can only be detected in the light of inspired words, the Bible is often used as a general referent. It is the reader's task to establish the proper semantic connection by interpreting whatever pertains to the letter without separating it from the spirit. I call this device a 'thematic clue'. It may consist of direct citations from the scriptures or of indirect references to sacred texts." [190] We have already had a taste of what this feels like from the previous paragraph where we established the connection to royalty of our two protagonists. This is all very important, the idea of not separating word and spirit and establishing the proper connection between texts. This whole concept is crucial in medieval literature on a philosophical plane, seeing that the basis of Christianity comes from the fact that there is a logical, straight and real semantic connection between both Testaments. Probably, the greatest example of this is found in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 8:26-35) when the Apostle Philip explains to the Ethiopian minister the connection between the Book of the Prophet Isaiah and its relationship to Jesus Christ and what had not long since taken place in Jerusalem. If we look to the wording and belief system of the Christians we see a logical chain appear. One third of the Godhead - *Logos*, who was the Word became a concrete human reality while keeping the ideal (spirit) of Godliness alive, for "[He] was without sin", (2Cor. 5:21). This is yet tied even deeper to the semantics of the name *Christos* which is Greek for the Hebrew, *Mashiach*. In this respect one can see that Christians are Jewish messianists. So, it is in this spirit that we

must guide ourselves and minds and that what we are looking for just does not necessarily jump out at us, but if we try to keep everything as a whole and not ignoring those semantic connections given to us then it will stay together very well. Turning our attention back to the GVC an the specific text that we are dealing with. The way in which Riccardo Picchio analyzed the *Vitae* of Constantine and Methodius is preferred, for Picchio let the text run, superscripted citation points and then commented and connected it all together. So, as it stands this style too will be used. The entry opens up in 1246 AD and starts:

> "When Danilo and Vasilko were in Dorogovsk, one of Batyj's voyevodas Mogučej sent an envoy to them demanding that they surrender Halyč. Danilo was greatly distressed by this for he had not fortified his land with citadels. After consulting with his brother, he set out to see Batyj (a), determined not to surrender half of his country and to go to see him in person. After praying to God, Danilo left on the feast of St. Demetrius (b) and came to Kiev. At that time Prince Jaroslav Vsevolodovič of Volodimir'-Suzdal' ruled Kiev through his boyar Dmitrij Jejkovič. Danilo went to the Vydubyči Monastery of God's champion the Archangel Michael and summoned the elders and the entire monastic order and requested the abbot and all the brothers to pray for him (c). And they prayed that he might receive Divine grace, which he did. Danilo fell on his knees before the icon of God's champion the Archangel Michael (d) and then left the monastery on a boat (e). On the way he saw great misery. At that
>
> (a) Dan. 1:3; Dan. 2:14-16, 24-25.
>
> (b) Dan. 9:20-21.
>
> (c) Dan 2:17-18.
>
> (d) Dan. 12:1, 10:21.
> (e) Dan. 8:2, 15; 10:4.

[190] Picchio, Riccardo. "The Function of Biblical Thematic Clues in the Literary Code of 'Slavia Orthodoxa'." pp.5-6.

point he began to grieve even more for he saw that they were ruled by the Devil; he witnessed their foul pagan acts of fornication and Chinggis Khan's flights of fancy such as his disgusting bloodsucking and endless sorcery (f). Emperors, princes and nobles, who came - all were led around a bush to worship the sun, the moon, the earth, and the Devil, as well as their deceased fathers, grandfathers and mothers (g) who were all in hell. Oh, how repugnant was their false faith! Danilo noticed this and became greatly distressed (h). (1245/6) Thence he went to Batyj, who was on the Volga, wishing to pay homage (i). There a vassal of Jaroslav Vsevolodovič called Songur approached him and suggested that since Danilo's "brother" Jaroslav had worshipped a bush, he should also (j). But Danilo replied that the Devil was speaking through his lips and that God would shut them so that no one would hear what he said (j1). And at that moment he was summoned by Batyj and was thus delivered by God from their godless devilry and sorcery (k). He bowed according to their custom and entered Batyj's tent (l). Batyj inquired why he had not come to him before this, but was nevertheless pleased that he did come now (m). Then Batyj inquired whether Danilo drank black milk, which was fermented mare's milk and was their favorite drink (n). Danilo confessed that he had not yet tried it, but would drink it if he wished, to which Batyj replied that Danilo was already one of them - a Tartar- and should therefore drink the beverage (o). Danilo drank the milk bowed in accordance with their custom (p), and said that he would

(f) Dan. 1:4,20; 2:2,10.

(g) Dan. 3:4-6; Ex. 20:1-6; Deut. 14:1-2; Mat. 22:32.

(h) Dan. 2:20-23, 27-28.

(i) Dan. 2:16, 24, 25.

(j) Dan. 3:8-18.

(k) Dan. Chapter 3.

(l) Dan. 2:37a; 6:21.

(m) Dan. 2:16, 25-26.

(n) Dan. 1:8.

(o) Dan. 1:10.

(p) Dan. 1:11-17.

now go and pay homage to the Grand Princess Barakčinova and Batyj agreed. Thus Danilo, went and paid homage as was their custom. Later, Batyj sent him a keg of wine, explaining that since Danilo was not used to drinking mare's milk he should drink wine (q). Oh, the greatest disgrace is to be thus honored by the Tatars. Indeed, the greatest disgrace is to be honored by the Tatars (r). Jaroslav, the Great Prince of Suzdal', was poisoned and Mixail, the prince of Černigov, who would not worship their bush was stabbed to death together with his boyar Fedor... that in their martyrdom they accepted their crowns of salvation (s). There was much wailing because of his humiliation [...] (t)." [191]

(q) Dan. 1:16-20.

(r) Dan. 5:29; Luke 6:26; Mat. 5:46.

(s) Dan. 3:20-22.

(t) Mat. 5:11-12; Ja. 1:12; 2Tim. 4:8; Mat. 10:38-39.

Again, it must be stated and reiterated as to what Picchio said, that the clues can be found as direct quotations or indirect references. Indeed, if the writers of the GVC had just copied verbatim the Book of Daniel then it would not strike us as any mark of literary genius. Yet, there is much beauty to be found and skill in the shaping Biblical quotes and citations into a congruent and literate piece of material. For the satisfaction of modern Western readers the gem, the literary value of the GVC comes in digging out the inferences showing the autonomous talent and thought processes of the author. Having been set in motion by circumstances and having to be qualified for its validity is now time to deal with the parallel Biblical story of Daniel.

When dealing with medieval literature or in fact any literature the writer is under the pressure of his subconscious to create an universe in which his characters live. The

---

[191] Pritsak, Omeljan. ed. The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. pp.58-9.

medieval author is no different and yet maybe more engaged in this than any other period. It is his job to put all writings into the cosmic perspective of the Holy Word. In this, he will find parallels of the two realities - Biblical/historical and his own. The author of the GVC has done this no differently than could have been expected. It is this parallel literary structure that flavors the writings and in turn gives depth and hence literary value.

Having established the validity of the two Daniels as royalty in the opening of the chapter [section (a) in our analysis of the text], in order to show the context and method of establishing biblical thematic clues, we are able to proceed with the rest of the text.The GVC mentions that Danilo Romanovič consults his brother about going to see Khan Batyj to dispute a land title. The sub-text lets us know that it is Khan Batyj who rules Rus' and that Danilo is but a princely vassal who must seek his (Batyj's) help, just as Daniel had to go to Babylon to stand in front of Nebuchadnezzar, and honour the 'new' Emperor (Dan.1:3-5,17). It also shows his potential and ability to deal with those who are most powerful in the world.

In the section marked (b), we see that both of the Daniels here are praying on an appointed religious festival, and it happens that the Archangel is involved in both of our instances. For one it was the evening sacrifice (Dan. 9:21) and the other it was a feast day of the Megalomartyr St. Dimitrius. The underlying theme here can only show that there are those that are worthy and those that must prove their worth. The time is now for Prince Danilo to accept his "cross" and then to overcome as did all saints and heroes throughout history.

In the section marked (c), the reference is found parallel to the story line in Daniel chapter 2. The verses of interest to us are verses 17 and 18; the background behind these

verses is the following: the wise men and counselors of Babylon were to be killed because they could not tell Nebuchadnezzar what dream he had, and he (Nebuchadnezzar) could not remember what the dream was about. Daniel upon knowing of this problem (being killed), went to the king and asked him for some time so that he, Daniel could find the answer. Daniel then decides on how to overcome the problem, he makes it a point to pray, not just alone, but with the most "trusted" and "faithful" in all of Babylon. "Then Daniel went to his house and made the decision known to Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah, his companions, that they might seek mercies from the God of heaven concerning this secret, so that Daniel and his companions might not perish with the rest of the wise men of Babylon." [192] Like Daniel, Danilo when beset with a problem beyond his grasp, calls on God and those he considers holy, as is mentioned in chapter 1 of this work, because the nature of Danilo is comparable to the nature of Daniel.

The next set of parallels (d) in our scripted text has Danilo Romanovič on his knees in front of the icon of God's champion the Archangel Michael. The monastery where Danilo Romanovič is staying is dedicated also to the Archangel. It gives the same tone as that of the Book of Daniel or even better as it sets the tone for what to expect from the information gleaned from the Bible. Firstly, the Polnyj pravoslavnyj bogoslovskij èniklopedičeskij slovar' states that, Mixail - Arxangel - vožd nebesnago voinstva. [193] The fact that in Hebrew Daniel means 'God is my Judge' and that the Galician Prince is asking Michael for help can imply that he, Danilo is free of sin and is a witness to the truth and in the end shall conquer as Michael comes to the rescue of his people especially, the man who is 'beloved of God' Daniel/Danilo. The religious connotations of Dan. 12:1-3 are also very

[192] Dan. 2:17-18.

powerful as it invokes the concept that Danilo is the sinless one of God who is the leader of Rus'. He follows the true faith and is heard of God. In this God will send his heavenly armies to come to his aid when the time is right. Why will this happen? It is explained, "At that time Michael shall stand up, the great prince who stands watch over the sons of your people." [194] Rus' is the new Israel, the beloved sons of God and that is why Michael is so important in this context, because it reinforces the idea of a Holy Rus'. That the last and youngest are the most beloved of God (Jn. 13:23) and that they have a special role to play in this cosmic structure made without hands since the foundation of the world.

The section marked (e) is only notable in that Daniel's greatest visions and those of Ezekiel were all by rivers (Dan. 10:4 and Ezek. 1:1). It is possible also for one to go on with this discourse in a theological paper, speaking levitically of course running water [195] is usually used in conjunction with the cleansing of disease and sin [in Hebrew it is known as a *Mikvah*, the ritual of purification only be running water]. This taken to the semantic level leads us to the New Testament and the baptism for the remission of sins. As Kiev in Orthodox Rus' was considered almost as holy as Jerusalem, the Dnipro river could be paralleled with the Jordan and seeing that the Vydubyči monastery lies in the river valley of the Dnipro, there could be a connection. All the same, Danilo is keeping in great company with these two Great Prophets.

The next section (f) has some subtleties in it that must be searched out at another time and in more detail than a master's thesis can offer, but the pagan acts of fornication

---

[193] Polnyj pravoslavnyj encklopedičeskij slovar'. p.1576. Entry: Mixail, Arxangel.
[194] Dan. 10:4
[195] Lev. 14:1-9.

mentioned in the chronicle[196] could come from two possible sources. The first and most enticing is probably akin to that of a pornographic movie with sex everywhere, very graphic and very grotesque. The second and not so exciting to the modern reader is the fall of a pure and holy nation before God as priests and kings (1 Pet. 2:5; Rev. 1:4-6). The martyred Mixail of Černigov reinforces this sentiment in his words, "Since God has delivered us and our lands into your (Batyj's) hands because of our sins, we will bow down to you and pay you homage." [197] This would also better lend understanding to the role of Michael who is the first of the seven Archangels and according to Jewish tradition is the one who weeps for humankind as our protector and helper. The idea here could be exactly how Ezra saw fornication when he returned to Jerusalem (Ezra chapter 9 deals with this problem exclusively). Only to give a brief outline of the problem, but intermarriage was a great problem as well as the acceptance of the customs of a heathen nation. The author considered not just a physical turning away but a spiritual one as well. One point that we could draw from here is the concept of spiritual defilement, if one goes over to the pagan faith and they have left Christianity then they have left the beautiful virgin and joined themselves to a whore or a defiled woman then they have committed fornication. If we look to the semantic similarities then we see in the Book of Daniel that Chaldean was synonym for sorcerer and that Batyj was as Nebuchadnezzar, the head of this problem of sorceries that defiled the land and the holy city.

The (g) section figures prominently in the Biblical story as a test of faith and so does it in the GVC too. This is the simple idea that there is only one God one faith and one

---

[196] Pritsak, Omeljan. ed. The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. p.58. N.B. The term fornication and intermarriage or intermingling will be used synonymously in this section in attempt to

Lord, who is the Author and Finisher of our salvation, the Alpha and the Omega according to the text of St. John the Revelator. In the light of Exodus chapter 20 and Deuteronomy chapters 8 and 28 we see that the post-modernist interpretation of religion will never be acceptable to the medieval world-view as it is in direct opposition to Divine Will. [198] And, just as the Biblical story of Daniel shows us the rewards of faithfulness from idol worship we too can expect that Danilo Romanovic's rewards will be no less. There is also an interesting hint of polemic mixed in with this passage of the GVC. The Bible condemns in Exodus 20:1-6 the worship of celestial bodies and other physical things of the Earth, the devil dragon god of the Babylonians -Bel, Marduk, or Baal-Hadad. Deuteronomy 14:1 hints at the perversity of 'cutting' one's self for the dead, but mentions nothing about the pure ancestor worship that was predominant in Rus'. It is very probably that the author of the GVC was disgusted with the worship of the "domovye" and was trying to attribute this atrocity to the new overlords citing them as the source of the defilement. Old Testament scholar Roland de Vaux, in his book Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions states, "Prayer and sacrifice of expiation for the dead (both incompatible with a cult of the dead) appear at the very end of the Old Testament, in 2 Macabees 12: 38-46 [...] These funeral rites have sometimes been explained as evidence for a cult of the dead. Sometimes the argument is that the deceased person was feared, and that the living therefore wanted to protect themselves from him, or to secure his goodwill; at other times, it is argued that the living attributed a kind of divinity to the dead. There is no foundation for either opinion in the Old Testament [...] We conclude that the dead were never honoured in a religious spirit, but

---

make clear the point what the author of the GVC and Perfecky were trying to portray. The proper term in this case would be *exogamy*. cf. Lev. 17:10-14 and 20:6.

[197] Ibid., p.53.

[198] Judges 21:24-25

that no cult was paid to them." [199] This, all could be resounded heartily, mingling this idea of Mat. 22:32 with the idea of worship of the dead leading into sub-section (h).

Here here in section (h) both of the Daniels are shown to know God and walk with Him physically and spiritually, knowing the real God of gods and King of kings leads to great distress in the soul of the true of the true believer who knows not the dark.[200]

Section (i) again shows how each of the Daniels are true and humble, while being 'above' their overlords they are not arrogant or so-minded as to not conform to the appropriate customs of the court thus making their characters more humble and appealing. In such cases one thinks of Joseph in Egypt, or David before Saul, or Christ before Pilate.[201]

In section (j), of course, brings into our mind all of the government councilors and various others that could be implied from the Judean Diaspora that apparently had worshipped the image on the plain of Dura because the account of Daniel only mentions the three young men Hananiah, Azariah, and Mishael who refused to worship in all the kingdom or at least in the province of Babylon. The text of Daniel 3 testifies to the fact that they were given a warning to worship the image no less than twice and by none other than the king, Nebuchadnezzar. We see in this instance that Danilo Romanovič, the least of the princes of Rus' was able to withstand the temptation which "emperors, princes and nobles" succumbed to. Hence this makes him (Danilo) worthy to stand in place of the missing Daniel in chapter 3. The scene is also one of interest as Songur is obviously not a Rus'ian but he is of official status as were those jealous of Daniel-Danilo. One even can be

---

[199] Vaux, Roland de. Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions. (trans. John McHugh) New York: McGraw-Hill. 1961. pp.60-1.
[200] Dan. 2:14-24.

led to believe that those accusers of the three young men in Daniel 3 were 'Tatars' in the mind of the author of the GVC, no less that Songur was. This also leads us to another connotation that begs one question, how educated, how schooled was the author of the GVC in the Bible and in Orthodox doctrine? If he was schooled and well versed then, the essence of Deuteronomy 13 has real meaning. If it is coupled with Deuteronomy 28, the blessings and curses; the sense of overcoming and victory in the lives of the three and of Danilo Romanovič is of immense vitality. As in the case of Lot (Abraham's nephew), for the sake of a few an entire people could be saved (Gen. 18:22-33), in this case Old and New Israel's fate hanging in the balance. As the three had answered Nebuchadnezzar, Danilo Romanovič answered Songur with a blessing that was a curse and it seemingly worked and in the end all of the faithful escaped death.

Section (k) is of an interesting nature. It is enough for now to point out that Daniel was nowhere to be seen, heard, or found at the dedication of the statue, no reference was made about his worship of the statue in order to entice the other three Hebrews to worship, so it would be false to say that he Daniel did worship the image made by Nebuchadnezzar. The textological similarity is so interesting that, the absence of one Daniel at a pagan worship ceremony seems to lead to the absence of Danilo Romanovič at the bush worship ceremony. It is with this that we turn to St. John Chrysostom's commentary on the Book of Daniel. In his explanation of Capter 3, where Daniel is absent Chrysostom says, "Počemu zdes' ne vidno Daniila? Mne kažecja, čto donoščiki iz straxa ne nazyvali ego, ili car', po uvaženiju k nemu, ne prinuždal ego, čtoby ne imet' v nem javnogo obličitelja. Nekotorye vidjat pričinu ètogo v tom, čto on nazyvalsja Valtasarom, - a čto imja bylo u nix

---

[201] Dan. 4:19-27, 5:17-29.

nazyvaniem idola, - i potomu Bog ustroil, čto Daniil ne byl brošen v peč', čtoby ne pripisali izbavlenija ego sile ètogo imeni i ne uklonilis' ot obličenija. [202] As we see, the situation which Chrysostom describes is a very close parallel with the GVC. Semantically speaking, neither Danilo or Daniil were put to the test of faith in a similar typological situation although both were publicly accounted for; and as Chrysostom said, "I potomu Bog ustroil čto Daniil ne byl brosen v peč'"[203] This is not much different than the calling of Danilo by Batyj at the last moment to get him to escape from this trial, as was not the case of Mixail and Fedor in the exact situation. As the parallel has it, Daniel escaped the trial as was presented in the Book of Daniel in accordance with Chrysostom's line of thinking and Mixail and Fedor were like the three young men in this, a representation of the eternal battle between good and evil.

Section (l) again shows that the tact and dignity of Danilo Romanovič is no less than that of a Daniel, David, Joseph, or Christ. It is of the utmost importance that we understand the eschatology and christology of the Christian faith. The fact that all of the Old Testament was a foreshadowing, prototype, of the New Testament and that it was these three human rulers of the Old Testament that were shadows or types of Christ. *Imitatio Christi* and more important to the medieval mind set was *Theosis*, or Beatification, or Transfiguration of the mortal into the divine, was the ultimate goal of all faithful whether in death or in life.

In section (m), the verses witness to us the fact that Daniel had already gone before the king, who was eagerly awaiting Daniel's return knowing that something good would

---

[202] Zlatoust, Ioann. Polnoe sobranie tvorenij svjatogo otca našego Ioanna Zlatousta. p.509.
[203] Ibid., p.509.

come from their meeting.[204] For Nebuchadnezzar it was an answer to a dream, for Batyj it was an answer of loyalty from one of his nobles.

Section (n) is a very important section tied to Daniel. It brings about the question of faithfulness and trust in God. It brings up the question of clean and unclean foods. This is, of course, tied to section (m) because of the nature of the problem. We of course must look at this problem from the view of the author/narrator who obviously believes in the cosmic order of history and the universe, and in finding universals we seem to have a problem with Danilo Romanovič. The problem is of clean and unclean foods. Apparently this is not purely a Jewish problem. In his book The Russian Religious Mind the author George Fedotov discusses this question. He says,

> "The fast regulations of the Eastern Church are much stricter than of the Roman Church even as they stood at the high age of medieval asceticism. As a reminder of the Mosaic ritual law the primitive Church retained the ban on consuming blood and things strangled (Acts 15:29). This so-called canon of the Apostles' council was repeated by the Constantinople or Trullan council of 680. It was never abrogated officially, but was dropped in the West sometime during the Middle Ages. In Russia it was in force until the end of Muscovite Tsardom about 1700." [205]

Fedotov again reinforces this position by quoting a 14th century document called "The Canon about the Believers in the Reptiles". This is also interesting because the surviving text is dated only a century after the feat of Danilo had taken place. The implications show that this belief existed and was strong or emotional enough to elicit dogmatization; as the written word was the strongest method of codification and carries a certain concreteness with it. The list of unclean animals which Fedotov mentions (excluding birds) goes as

---

[204] Dan. 2:16,26,46; 5:18-19.

follows: "Those who eat wolf, fox, she-bear, hedge-hog, marten, squirrel, and others which are unclean, turtle and each beast, small or big, or horses, or donkeys and those from wild or domesticated animals which the law of God [Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14] called unclean, if they will be found eating by their own will and wish, shall repent for four years." [206] Fedotov even goes further, giving concrete examples of the all-encompassing nature of this belief and some history to it as well. In the last canon, the sin of merchants is defined exactly as "going to the heathen and eating unclean food." [207]

> "Why the food of the heathen is unclean can be explained either by the spiritual uncleanness of heathendom infecting even their bodies and all bodily life, or - and this is the most relevant point - by the uncleanness of their food itself. Indeed, the Russian authors like to expatiate about the indiscriminate diet of the heathen which inspires their disgust." [208]

Speaking of different tribes of the Eastern Slavs the author of the Primary Chronicle writes:

> "a Derevljani živjaxu zvrěskym" obrazom". živušče skot'sky i oubivaxu drug" druga iadušče vse neč[is]to [...] a Radimiči i Vjatiči i Severo odin obyca[i] imjaxu živjaxi v lěsě iako že vsjakyi zvěr[i] iadušče vse neč[is]to."[209]

This story that Fedotov shares next fits very well into the cosmic/apocalyptic view of the universe and history. It is this eschatology that helps to set up the idea or actions or reactions with the hero Danilo Romanovic.

> "On another page, while tracing the genealogy of the Pecenegs, Polovci and other nomad enemies of Russia, the chronicler speaks

---

[205] Fedotov, George P. The Russian Religious Mind: Kievan Christianity. Cambridge: Harvard, 1946. pp.183-4.
[206] Ibid., p.185.
[207] Ibid., p.187.
[208] Ibid., p.188.
[209] Polnoe sobranie russkix letoposej. T.2. Moscow: AN SSSR. 1962. p.10

of the legendary nations shut up in the mountains by Alexander the Great. His source is the apocryphal Methodius of Patara: [210]

"g[lago]lja Oleksander" c[a]r' Makidon'skii v"zyde na v"stočnyja strany do morja. narěcaemoe s[o]lnce město i vidě č[e]l[o]v[ě]ky neč[is]tyja ot plemeni Afetova. ix"že neč[is]totu vivěb" iadajaxu skvernu vsjaku: komary, muxy, kotky, změja. m[e]rtveca ne pogrebati no jadjaxu i žen'skiě iz"vragy (iadjaxu) i skoty vsja nečistyja. to viděv" Oleksandr" oubojasja eda kako oumožat' oskvernjat' zemlju. na polunoščnyia strany ou gory vysokyja i B[og]u povelěvšju sostupišasja o nix" gory polunošč'nyja. [...] jaže sut' v gorax polunoščnyx" po povelěn'ju B[o]ž'ju."[211]

Much of what has been said here is more than familiar to us as we read over Danilo's account of his trip to visit Khan Batyj. The apocalyptic imagery here contained, the holiness, and the evil contrasts and parallels are very great. It is with this in mind that we recapitulate the argument with one more quote by Fedotov, "The prohibition against consuming blood led to many caustic problems solved in different ways by the bishop of Novgorod. He sees "no harm in eating the blood of fish but objected to the drinking of milk of a newly-delivered cow, because it is with blood." [212] In putting everything into its context, we must look back to the reason behind the clean and unclean issue. Firstly, horses were considered unclean animals. Secondly, the beverage that Danilo is to drink is mare's milk. Thirdly, it is black in colour and apparently fairly thick, which would make an onlooker to believe that is blood i.e., black in colour and thick because it is fermented and it could maybe pass as coagulated blood. To add to this contention we will look to the Scriptures which define the parameters of our argument, Lev. 11:4,8,26, and 33 give us a good picture of the clean/unclean problem. Added to this is the validity of the blood question that was affirmed by the Holy Apostles which had been handed down in the

---

[210] Fedotov, George. The Russian Religious Mind. p.188.
[211] Polnoe sobranie russkix letoposej. T.2. Moscow: AN SSSR. 1962. pp.225-6.

command given to Moses by God Himself in Deut. 12:23-25. Verse twenty-seven tells us that the blood is to be offered as a sacrifice to God Himself. In understanding the neo-Platonic mind and the consequences of philosophical thought, it is important to reiterate the fact that it is necessarily so that when looking at universal absolutes that ABC will mean the same thing as LMN and even at the end of time ABC will still have the same meaning as XYZ. Put most plainly, the action to consume forbidden, ritually unclean food was a sin. When we look to other instances where blood is involved, we possibly see a similar attitude in the Fourteen Byzantine Rulers of Michael Psellus as he states,

> "When they (Patzinaks/Pečenegs) are thirsty, if they find water, either from springs or in the streams, they at once throw themselves down into it and gulp it up; if there is no water, each man dismounts from his horse, opens its veins with a knife and drinks the blood. So they quench their thirst by substituting blood for water. After that they cut up the fattest of their horses, set fire to whatever wood they find ready to hand, and, having slightly warmed the chopped limbs there on the spot, they gorge themselves on the meat, blood and all." [213]

As Psellus is so good at humiliating his enemies in a very subtle way, he points out to his reader the grotesque features of the barbarian, eating not only horse but the blood as well making them unclean in every way, physically and spiritually. As we will see later, the breaking of such a law will have bad reverberations for Danilo in the future.

Section (o) has a very real parallel with the Book of Daniel, only rather than being glorious in faith, it shows the weaknesses of our hero. Danilo here is much unlike the Daniel of the Bible, rather than exercising his courage and faith and if need be accepting his martyr's crown he was at best like a servant before Khan Batyj. Here we can justify his

---

[212] Fedotov, George. The Russian Religious Mind. p.185.
[213] Psellus, Michael. Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. p.319.

political position in our modern thinking i.e., situation ethics, but in front of his friends and peers it was a very weak thing to do if using the GVC and its author as a marker of social, moral, or religious issues. If we look at the concept of "Porjadok kosmosa i porjadok istorii v mirovozzrenii rannego srednevekov'ja", which, to paraphrase, Averincev is seeing the reflection of the heavenly, universal, and divinity in all things of this world, and that all things of this world must be in accordance to the design of the heavenly, universal and divine, we see that Danilo is doomed in more of a figurative sense. It is not in a way that will happen instantaneously as a lightning bolt from heaven, that is saved for the conversion of souls of which Saul of Tarsus is the prototype, but it can be seen in the curses of Deuteronomy 28. It is very interesting to note that here in the GVC the curse is applied to one person, the individual rather than to the nation as a whole. The fact that the nation does not receive the curse because of the actions of one man seem to have their roots stemming from the influence of Ezekiel 18 looking from verses 19-32 concentrating especially on verse 24 as it deals with the individual propensity to sin. This is the situation and the mind frame that would make up the reason for Danilo's "fall". Aside from this Biblical quote and rationalization according to scripture, the concept of the individual was also a topic of dogma within the Orthodox Church. Alexander Kazhdan mentions this school of thought or the understanding of the individual,

> "But the intensity of his moral inclinations was so exceptional and his principles of human demeanor as it was presented by Symeon so closely resembled the admonitive of secular authors his junior that we may regard Symeon as the founder of a new approach. Symeon's moral doctrine stressed the individual way to salvation [or damnation, S.R.E.] and the rejection of such social ties as family and

> friendship, he required also a complete self-subjugation to God and - on earth - to one's spiritual father." [214]

In this we can also see that the individual is of great importance to the Byzantine Orthodox. It is the individual that is responsible for their actions and in this one will show themselves as a microcosm of universal history. For we know concretely about the life of Daniel and that his sacrifice took him on to greater and more glorious things such as, becoming called "O Daniel, man greatly beloved (of God)." [215] Again when we look at this whole aspect of sinning against the command of God and one is being compared to one of the greatest Biblical heroes, the question must be asked, "[Shall we] not find any charge against this Daniil[o] unless we find it against him concerning the law of his God?" [216] Obviously the answer for Daniel was, "but they could find no charge or fault, because he was faithful; nor was there any error or fault found in him." [217] But for Danilo this is now no longer the case as shall be pointed out exactly why later.

Section (p) is obviously intertwined with the preceding section. The action shifts to the part where he has now drunken the 'kumiss' as was their custom and went to pay homage to the Grand Princess. Again the contrast here is with the Daniel of the Bible. More really not be said about this as it was covered in the last discussion [218]. It just seems that Danilo is having his nemesis set up here in Daniel 1:11-17 and verses 16 and 17 are particularly condemning.

---

[214] Každan, A.P. and Ann Wharton Epstein. Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries. Berkeley:UC Press, 1985. p.207.
[215] Dan. 10:11.
[216] Dan. 6:5.
[217] Dan. 6:4,22.
[218] See pages 105-7 of this work under section (o).

Section (q) seems to give Danilo a bit of reprieve in that Batyj gives him a keg of wine afterwards because he is not used to it (kumiss) and in this, favor is yet found in Danilo.

Yet, why does the mood change so drastically in the very next sentence that embodies section (r). One reason could be simply that Danilo is still a great prince and a warrior and leader and to wholeheartedly condemn him before him would be suicide without cause, i.e., no martyrdom. But, one cannot lightly overlook the sin committed by Danilo. The old tactic of praising before criticizing is used by the author of the GVC. One reasonably has to ask, if Daniel was thrice honored or even four times honored by two different heathen tribes, what could be the problem with Danilo. The author of the book of Daniel never criticizes Daniel even when he becomes the second most powerful man in the East. It seems to be the ideal of "Porjadok kosmosa i porjadok istorii v mirovozzrenii rannego srednevekov'ja" that has now shown itself in the life of Daniel as it was also seen in the life of Joseph in Egypt. We now must also examine Daniel's reactions to all of this "glory". One could gather from the information that glory sought Daniel, such is in the case of Belshazzar and Darius. There is too another way to look at the condemning of Danilo and ask what is the reality of it. Now, one has to discard the mind set of the medieval scholar and look at something more modern and interpret his actions in a pragmatic light (situation ethics). We notice that Daniel helped a pagan king to save his own life (Dan. 2) and so why was it so bad to drink the kumiss and become a Tatar? The only answer to that would be found on the semantic, and maybe etymological level. Daniel always kept the title of Hebrew/Jew/Judean as is seen in the attacks against his character. In light of the semantic weight of the text, when Danilo drinks the kumiss he is calling

himself a Tatar. This is unlike Daniel who never equates himself with his captors, the heathen of whom he separates himself from, with his friends right in the very beginning of the Book of Daniel. John Chrysostom states, "Togda Ariox. govoritsja, s pomščaniem vvede Daniila pred carja, i reče emu obretox muža ot **synov plena židovska**[219], iže skazanie carju vozvestit. Ot synov plena, govorit, obrětox muža. Ne postydilsja ego proisxoždenija, potomu čto pri zatruditel'nyx obstojatel'stvax ni o čem podobnom ne sprašivajut, i vsjakaja gordostí, obyčnaja v ščastii, podavljaetsja." [220] Philosophically, we see that through his silence, Danilo could have denied who he was, while it is fairly concrete that Daniel affirmed who he was. Maybe, this is why them being so close in lives lived that they were sometimes far apart in actions done. It may imply that by consuming the beverage Danilo was not confessing Christ before men therefore the condemnation seems to stand in place. Even if this were not true, the Biblical undertones are condemning enough - be wary - as Christ himself warned, when men speak well of you (the parallel here is very nice) as did the fathers to the false prophets (Luke 6:26) and for Danilo, - the worst of the heathen.

Section (s) of this parallel rendering is of great value to us. We see here the author's eschatology and his Christology. Where does this lead us? Where does this take us? We often forget that because of the great feat that was accomplished in the furnace that it necessarily had to be so. But, the word of the three young men from the Book of Daniel bear witness to what could have been and what could and did happen. Verse 17 states that the young men believed that God was going to save them but verse 18 tells us, "But if not,

---

[219]The bold text was reproduced as found in the Polnyj sobranie tvorenij svjatogo otca našego Ioanna Zlatousta and was not supplied by S.R.E.

[220] Zlatoust, Ioann. Polnyj sobranie tvorenij svjatogo otca našego Ioanna Zlatousta. pp.500-1.

let it be known to you O king, that we do not serve your gods, nor will we worship the gold image which you have set up." [221] As we know, they were thrown into the fiery furnace and came out to witness of God's power. But the fact of the matter is that they were martyred. Their words and deeds spoke as those who believed in Yahweh but were confident in their deaths. In this, we see a parallel of Prince Mixail of Černigov and his boyar Fedor. In the GVC the author quotes him as saying, "From there he went to Batyj to ask him to confirm the ownership of his lands. But Batyj requested that he first worship in the faith of his Tatar ancestors. To this Mixail replied: 'Since God has delivered us and our lands into your hands because of our sins, we will bow down to you and pay you homage. But we will not worship in the faith of your ancestors; we will not obey this order of yours which is blasphemy in the eyes of God.' Thereupon Batyj flew into a rage like a wild beast and ordered Mixail's execution." [222] Later, the author tells us of this feat that Mixail had accomplished, "[...] Mixail, the prince of Černigov who would not worship their bush was stabbed to death with a knife together with his boyar Fedor. We had previously related their murder and that in their martyrdom they accepted their crowns of salvation." [223] It is not possible to say how important it was for Danilo to act according to the model of heroic actions and history all laid out before him. There is also a great probability that the author of the chronicle is greatly ashamed of Danilo but because of political reality cannot openly condemn him. If we look at the chronological placement of events, we see that there was a problem with land holdings. He decides to go to see Batyj, but the first thing that he does is go and get God's help. Danilo uses the feast day, a holy day to start his mission, has a

---

[221] Dan. 3:18.
[222] Pritsak, Omeljan. ed. The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. p.53.
[223] Ibid., p.59.

saint ready (St. Demetrius), the whole monastery prays for him and even has an Archangel at his disposal, and so on. Given the circumstances and history it can be more or less expected that the GVC author is a religious person of some sort. If this is safe to say, then, given the fact that Danilo drank the unclean beverage after appealing to his God for help and help on such a large scale (this was more than placing a candle in front of an icon), then, he (Danilo) might have done a dishonour to himself, his God and Christianity as, the words are well thought out on behalf of the author and carry such weight in the sub-textual understanding.

Section (t) is but a continuation of this process of demeaning Danilo positively/constructively because of his actions rather than following the Divine Will of Holy Writ recorded centuries before he is humiliated outright. If we look at the Biblical text we also see that there are three times when any of our heroes step out in faith to God and were rewarded. The first being Daniel and the three young men taking responsibility for the lives of the wise men of Babylon (Dan. 2:24). The second, the three, Hananiah, Azariah, and Mishael took responsibility to show what true worship was and Who it was that deserved that worship (Dan. 3:18). Thirdly, Daniel alone prophesied the downfall of Belteshazzar at the risk of his own life (Dan. 5:17-23). In all of these three situations those who were humble before God were raised up to positions of greatness. Also of interesting note, that the use of 3's prevail in these situations, possibly as oral narration uses three's. And as much as the perfection of Daniel, we have the anti-perfection of Danilo as he was bewailed in the text of the GVC as to the humiliation of being honored by the Tatars in any way shape of form, also three times. It is also a note of biblical interest that the author of the GVC mentions several times the humiliation of Danilo by the Tatars. It is of interest to

us this word humiliation, because biblically speaking humiliation also had the connotation of being taken advantage of - literally and symbolically. It is then in this symbolic sense that we see how deep was the fall of Danilo Romanovic by a single mug of kumiss.

If then we take the next logical step following all of these unhappy events in the life of our hero we can gain a much more enlightened view of the end of his career. Whether of not it is possible of worthwhile to create a semantico-logical chain on the word humiliation one can instantly see that once you have been humiliated you have been humbled. After all, we were not present to Danilo's attendance before the Khan but his words servitude tell us, "Danilo confessed that he had not yet tried it (kumiss), but would drink it if he (Batyj) wished [...]" [224] He humbled himself before Batyj or was humbled by Batyj it seems to make no difference. It is a point of interest that the Book of Deuteronomy mentions the humbling of a person 4 times and the first is about how God humbles a proud heart. The next 3 are concerned with the humbling of a woman and the last of these is concerned with the fact that if you humble a maiden then she is bound to you forever (Deut. 22:29). Logically speaking, if according to patriarchal thinking, the wife is simply the weaker of the two in a relationship then when Paul says in Romans, "For the woman which hath a husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth." [225] Not to demean or belittle Danilo we could say that it is not so much Khan Batyj that is the "husband" but maybe it is the "Tartar" nation of whom the Khan currently is the symbolic head, for the Khan did say that Danilo was a "Tatar" and that through his silent submission Danilo could be seen to acquiesce to this statement. Why then should this seemingly trivial incident take on such a grand air? Because it reflects the end result or breaking with history, the cosmic

---

[224] Ibid., p.58.

order and the Law of God. In the entry dated under 1259, November we have one small sentence, "He [Bishop Ivan] also told him [Danilo] of Burondaj's rage. Danilo became frightened and fled to Poland and then from Poland he fled to Hungary," where consequently he died in 1264 of illness and his body was brought back and buried in Xolm. [226] A rather inglorious death for such a hero and soldier who subdued all of the East and made emperors of the West acknowledge the strength of the King of Rus'. Knowing his great feats in battle it is rather odd to see him finish his career in such a low manner. Such a great warrior was Danilo Romanovič that it is impossible to comprehend why he was so afraid of Burondaj. His fear was so great that he even left his sons in Rus' and fled with only his wife for safety. In this we have the parallel of a hero and an anti-hero, a Daniel and an anti-Daniel, following in the shadow yet not fully seeing the necessity or value in how to step into the form or position of Daniel of the Bible although seeing and knowing how faith was rewarded.

The final parallel that could draw the two Daniels together is the fact that neither of them could die in their own land and that both remained exiles in their old age into death. Which as Khan Otrok said at the beginning of the GVC that, "It is better to die in one's own land than to achieve fame in a foreign one". [227] The obvious has been pointed out and explained in great length, that systematic understanding and searching for biblical thematic clues will be a great reward for those that are looking to enhance and further the science and study of Medieval Slavic literature.

---

[225] Romans 7:2
[226] Pritsak, Omeljan. ed. The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. pp.78, 84.
[227] Ibid., p.17.

Conclusion

It is difficult to state the obvious better than Omelijan Pritsak or A.A. Pautkin when talking on the topic of Old East Slavic literature; but one point is made clear from studying the literature of the Kievan era, the depth and breadth of each of the works. What role does the chronicle play in this point made clear to us? The GVC rounds out the literature of the Kievan era. How is this so? While Pritsak rightly states that it is greatly magnified because of its 'ornamental' style, we see the GVC as a culmination of that which Pritsak states most eloquently combined with what Pautkin says of the historical value in the attention paid to Danilo, making for us in fact, an extremely gripping psychological work balancing history, reality, idealization, and emotion. This in a sense adds to the comment of Pritsak, that the "true" Kievan style was 'monumental' in its formation; making for us a 'monument' of literature on the life of Danilo Romanovič. As I said before, rounding out the literature of the Kievan era making it worthy of study.

So, what is it that we have set out to uncover? This mandate was set at the very beginning of this study, "It is the purpose of this paper to look into the question of the ideal or image of the ruler in the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. This, we have done. The theme of the image or ideal of the ruler in Rus' is one that cosmetically seems very narrow, yet when dealing with this theme, presents itself as being in many respects, monumental. The reason being, at least in our situation, is the cosmopolitan nature of the theme, and secondly, the cosmopolitan nature of the subject topic - the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. There are many ways of addressing this theme but what is most pertinent to us in the modern literary field, looking back on history would be the politics, religion and literature of the era. This again is too, a simplified understanding. For in dealing with this topic in concert with the GVC one is immediately "confronted" with history. Is this then defined

as, the bare facts of time and places? No, it is the history of those above mentioned subjects - politics, religion, and literature. Again, these topics might seem to lead one further from the point, but do not, they clarify, they validate them. Clarity, of course, to some is relative and this may be so in this instance. The history of politics, religion, and literature that is of extreme interest to us, is by no means isolated to "western Rus'", or even Rus' itself. The introduction of this study dealt conclusively with this topic, making it notable that the image to the ruler in Rus' is tied, without any doubt to the conflict of Europe and Asia; Orient and Occident; antiquity and modernity; and can not be seen as isolated from these dualties.

Taking these dualities into account was the reasoning behind chapter one of this work. I feel that the ideas and ideals behind the image of the ruler in the GVC were codified in the GVC through the works of Ljubarskij, Averincev, Picchio, Psellus, and the Book of Daniel. And, through them the ideal or image of the ruler in Rus' was made clear to us, as the mists of history dissipated before us.

From Ljubarskij's article, "Istoričeskij geroj v Xronografii Mixaila Psella", we discovered nine characteristics that make up the historical hero in classic Byzantine philology. Having this wealth of information at our disposal, we measured the hero of the GVC, Danilo Romanovič Halic'kyj to the rule we found in Ljubarskij's article. And we found that he measured up to the standards that were set for the greatest of emperors. On a separate, yet connected plane, we utilized the work of S.S. Averincev in his article "Porjadok kosmosa i porjadok istorii v mirovozzrenii rannego srednevekov'ja". This article made clear the influence of neo-Platonic and biblical poetics and their influence on and from Byzantine society. This is what made up the logic of, and bulk of chapter two.

In chapter three, we stepped over to the approach of R. Picchio, who extolled his theories on "Models and Patterns in the Literary Tradition of Medieval Orthodox Slavdom" and on "The Function of Biblical Thematic Clues in the Literary Code of 'Slavia Orthodoxa'." Which meant finding the underlying Biblical theme and story in the medieval text used, and was the only way to understand the text used. This is also why we came to use St. John Chrysostom as a sub-approach to the end goal of finding the 'thematic clue' and the image or ideal of the ruler. Here, again in concert, this approach is joined to the first two, yet now expanding the universality of the three of them. In this, we are saying, there is a classical or ancient approach to this poetic, that opens the poetic's comprehensibility to the modern reader via Divine Will or Scriptural basis. Having grouped these together, and moving from this block to Psellus it may seem a little disjointed but it isn't. Psellus was used of course, because his work is textologically and semantically similar to the GVC. Focusing on the "hero" as an end in itself rather than the classic "history of the world from Adam to present", which presents heroes as footnotes only.

In reality, the method was simple and easily done, as we compared and contrasted Psellus' work the Fourteen Byzantine Rulers and the Book of Daniel with the GVC. Having seen fully, the unfolding similarity between the GVC and Psellus' Chronographia and the poetical connection; the Picchio methodology allows us not only to be contained within Psellus, but to search deeper for, as it were, a third level of interpretation of the GVC. This would be, the Book of Daniel. Based on the understanding of the literary history, the poetics and philosophical/theological comprehension, the Book of Daniel was also paralleled and compared to the GVC. In particular, one episode from the life of Danilo Romanovic seems to get its inspiration from the pages of the Book of Daniel. From the

aspect of Ljubarskij, Averincev, Picchio, and Psellus, the Book of Daniel is a valid approach textologically, semantically and historically.

The methodologies which we have used stand up to the scrutiny of academic testing. In themselves, they stand well alone and in concert do not contradict themselves, but lend full compliment one to the other culminating in a logical and coherent argument. The evidence is set before the reader in what is hoped a palatable form. It is obvious that the decision is up to the reader to discuss whether or not it is "correct" to create a link between the methods used and the end result of this study, which is, I believe, a promising approach to the understanding of the ideal or image of the ruler in Rus'. The conclusions reached at the end of this examination are very optimistic. There is a possibility that the formation of the Galician portion of the chronicle and the hero of the Galician portion were influenced by the poetics of Michael Psellus and the Book of Daniel as I have hoped to show through the supporting methodologies mentioned previously. It is believed that this argument holds well the weight of the ideal of the ruler in Rus' and opens this field to further study on the poetics, content, and sources of the GVC.

Bibliography

Works Cited

Averincev, A.A. "Porjadok kosmosa i porjadok istorii v mirovozzrenii rannego srednevekov'ja." Antičnost' i Vizantija. Moscow: Nauka, 1978.

Doukan, Zak. Stenanie zemli: Issledovanie knigi proroka Daniila. (trans. I. Makarceva) Moscow: Istočnik žizni, 1995.

Doukhan, Jacques B., Hebrew for Theologians: A Textbook for the Study of Biblical Hebrew in Relation to Hebrew Thinking. Lanham, MA: University Press of America, 1982.

Evseev, Nikita A., Kniga proroka Daniila v drevne-slavjanskom perevode. Moscow: Imperatorskaja amkademia nauk, 1905.

Hens'ors'kyj, A.I. Halyc'ko-volyns'kyj litopis. Kyiv: AN URSR, 1958.

Isaevic, Ja.D. "Kul'tura Galicko-Volynskoj Rusi." Voprosy istorii. 1, 1973.

Kazdan, Aleksandr and Giles Constable. People and Power in Byzantium. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1991.

Kazdan, Aleksandr and Ann Wharton Epstein. Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

Litavrin, G.G. "Rus' i Vizantija v XII veke." Voprosy istorii. 7, 1972.

Ljubarskij, Ja. N. "Istoričeskii geroj v Xronografii Mixaila Psella." Vizantijskij vremennik. T.33. 1972.

Pautkin, A.A. "Izobraženie knjazja-voina v Galickoj letopisi." Ruskaja reč'. 3, 1982.

---------- "Sozda grad imenem Xolm." Ruskaja reč'. 1, 1989.

Picchio, Riccardo. "The Function of Biblical Thematic Clues in the Literary Code of 'Slavia Orthodoxa'." Slavica Hiersolymitana. University of Jerusalem. 1, 1977.

----------. "Models and Patterns in the Literary Tradition of Medieval Orthodox Slavdom." American Contributions to the Seventh International Congress of Slavists, Warsaw, August 21-21,1973. Vol. 2. Edited by V. Terras. The Hague-Paris: Mouton, 1973.

Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej. [reprint] vol. 2 Moscow: Izdatel'stvo vostochnoi literatury, 1962.

Polnyj pravoslavnyj encklopedičeskij slovar'. V 2-x tomax. Sankt-Peterburg: P.P.Sojkin, 1913.

Pope, Richard. "O xaraktere i stepeni vlijanija vizantijskoj literatury na original'nuju literaturu južnyx i vostočnyx slavjan: Diskussija i metodologija." American Contributions to the Seventh International Congress of Slavists, Warsaw, August 21-21,1973. Vol. 2. Edited by V. Terras. The Hague-Paris: Mouton, 1973.

Pritsak, Omeljan. ed. The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. (trans. George Perfecky) 16(2) Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1973.

Psellus, Michael. Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. (trans. E.R.A. Sewter) Baltimore: Penguin, 1966.

Smirnova, E.A. *et al.* Izbornik Svajatoslava 1073 goda: Naučnyj apparat faksimil'nogo izdanija. Moscow: Kniga, 1983.

Udal'cova, Z.V. *et al.* "Drevnjaja Rus'- zona vstreči civilizacij." Voprosy istorii. 6, 1980.

Vaux, Roland de. Ancient Israel: Its life and Institutions. (trans. John McHugh) New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Zlatoust, Ioann. Polnoe sobranie tvorenija svjatogo otca našego Ioanna Zlatousta v russkom perevode. T. 6, kniga 1. S-Peterburg: S-Peterburgskaja Duxovnaja Akademia, 1900.